arXiv:1108.3109v1 [math.CA] 15 Aug 2011

WEIGHTED ESTIMATES FOR DYADIC PARAPRODUCTS AND T-HAAR MULTIPLIERS WITH COMPLEXITY (M, N)

JEAN CARLO MORAES AND MARÍA CRISTINA PEREYRA

Abstract. We extend the definitions of dyadic paraproduct and t-Haar multipliers to dyadic operators that depend on the complexity (m, n), for m and n positive integers. We will use the ideas developed by Nazarov and Volberg in [NV] to prove that the weighted $L^2(w)$-norm of a paraproduct with complexity (m, n) associated to a function $b \in BMO$, depends linearly on the A_2-characteristic of the weight w, linearly on the BMO-norm of b, and polynomially in the complexity. This argument provides a new proof of the linear bound for the dyadic paraproduct [Be1] (the one with complexity $(0, 0)$). Also we prove that the L^2-norm of a t-Haar multiplier for any t and weight w depends on the square root of the C_{2t}-characteristic of w times the square root of the A_2-characteristic of w^{2t} and polynomially in the complexity (m, n), recovering a result of Beznosova [Be] for the $(0, 0)$-complexity case.

1. Introduction

In the last decade many mathematicians devoted their attention to find how the norm of some operators in a weighted space depends on the so called A_p-characteristic of the weight. The first result of this type was due to Buckley in 1993, in [Bu] he proved that, for $p > 1$

$$\|Mf\|_{L^p(w)} \leq C[w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \|f\|_{L^p(w)},$$

where M is the maximal function, w is a weight that is a locally integrable positive a.e. function, and $f \in L^p(w)$ if and only if $\|f\|_{L^p(w)} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x)|^p w(x)dx\right)^{1/p} < \infty$. Recall that a weight w belongs to the

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42C99 ; Secondary 47B38.

Key words and phrases. Operator-weighted inequalities, Dyadic paraproduct, A_p-weights, Haar multipliers.

The first author was supported by a fellowship CAPES/FULBRIGHT, 2918-06/4.

Muckenhoupt A_p-class if and only if

$$[w]_{A_p} := \sup_I \left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w(x)\,dx\right)\left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}(x)\,dx\right)^{p-1} < \infty,$$

where $[w]_{A_p}$ denotes the A_p-characteristic of the weight.

In 2000, Wittwer showed [W] that the norm of the martingale transform in $L^2(w)$ depended linearly in the A_2-characteristic of the weight, $[w]_{A_2}$. Independently the same linear bound was shown to hold for the dyadic square function [W1], [HukTV]. This was then shown for the Ahlfors-Beurling transform [PetV], with important consequences in the theory of quasiconformal mappings. In 2007, Petermichl [Pet2] published the linear dependence for the Hilbert transform, and soon after for the Riesz transforms [Pet3]. Petermichl's work is based on her representation of the Hilbert transform as an average of dyadic shift operators of complexity $(0,1)$, [Pet1]. In 2008, Beznosova [Be1] also proved linear dependence in the A_2-characteristic for the $L^2(w)$-norm of the dyadic paraproduct. More precisely, for T, any of the above mentioned operators, all $w \in A_2$ there is a $C_T > 0$ such that

$$\|Tf\|_{L^2(w)} \le C_T[w]_{A_2}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}.$$

These linear estimates in $L^2(w)$ imply corresponding $L^p(w)$-bounds, by the sharp extrapolation theorem [DGPPet].

It was proved in [P2] that the L^2-norm for the Haar multiplier T_w depends on the square of the RH_2-characteristic of the weight w in the Haar multiplier's definition. The Haar multipliers and the dyadic paraproducts are closely related, the resolvent of the dyadic paraproduct is a cousin of T_w [P]. In her PhD dissertation, Beznosova showed that the L^2-norm of a t-Haar multipliers, T^t_w, defined in [KP], is bounded by a constant times the square root of the C_{2t}-characteristic of w times the square root of the A_2-characteristic of w^{2t}. Recall that a weight $w \in RH_2$ if $[w]_{RH_2} := \sup_I \big(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w^2(x)dx\big)^{1/2}\big(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w(x)dx\big)^{-1} < \infty$; and for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, a weight $w \in C_{2t}$ if

$$[w]_{C_{2t}} := \sup_I \big(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w^{2t}(x)dx\big)\big(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w(x)dx\big)^{-2t} < \infty.$$

All these works use the Bellman function technique. Those methods were used as well by Chung [Ch] to obtain quadratic bounds for the commutator of the Hilbert transform and a BMO function. This quadratic bound was later shown to be true for all operators for which the linear bound in $L^2(w)$ holds [ChPPz] with an argument that has nothing to do with Bellman functions. Bellman functions have impacted not only the theory of weights as described here, but also other areas in harmonic analysis, see [V] for more insights and references.

Many efforts were done to show a linear dependence in the A_2-characteristic of the $L^2(w)$ norm for a large class of operators. In particular for all Calderón-Zygmund operators, the so-called A_2-conjecture. Lacey, Petermichl, and Reguera in [LPetR] proved the linear A_2-bounds for all Haar shift operators, and all operators that were averages of Haar shift operators with bounded complexity (including Hilbert, Riesz, and Beurling-Ahlfors transforms), this was the first class of operators to be shown to have the linear A_2-bounds. Their results depend exponentially in the complexity of the Haar shifts, so does an alternative proof presented soon after in [CrMPz]. Despite this fact, the argument in [CrMPz] is very flexible and can be adapted to obtain sharp bounds for paraproducts, square functions, vector-valued operators, and two-weight settings, as well as for fractional integrals and commutators [Le], [CrMoe], [Or]. Neither of these arguments uses Bellman functions, unlike all the previous work for individual operators.

Finally in the Summer 2010, Hytönen in [H] proved the A_2-conjecture, that is he showed that for *all* Calderón-Zygmund integral singular operators T in $\mathbb{R}^d$, weights $w \in A_p$, there is $C_{p,d,T} > 0$ such that,

$$\|Tf\|_{L^p(w)} \leq C_{p,d,T}[w]_{A_p}^{\max\{1,\frac{1}{p-1}\}}\|f\|_{L^p(w)}.$$

His result is based on results of Pérez, Treil, and Volberg in [PzTV], and in a very clever representation theorem for T in terms of Haar shift operators of arbitrary complexity, which generalizes Petermichl's representation theorem for the Hilbert transform [Pet1]. In [HPzTV] a more succinct proof of the A_2-conjecture was given. See [L1] for a survey of the A_2-conjecture including a rather complete history of most results that appeared up to november 2010, and that contributed to the final resolution of this mathematical puzzle. An important and hard part of the proof was to obtain bounds for Haar shifts operators that depend linearly in the A_2-characteristic and at most polynomially in the complexity (m,n). In 2011, Nazarov and Volberg [NV] provided a beautiful new proof that still uses Bellman functions but minimally, and that can be transferred to geometric doubling metric spaces [NV1, NRezV]. Treil [T], independently [HLM+] are able to obtain linear dependence in the complexity. Crucial in both [NV] and [HLM+] is the use of some stopping time argument (it is called a corona decomposition in [LPetR, L1, HLM+]).

As the martingale transform was extended to the Haar shifts with complexity (m,n), it seems natural to attempt the same extension for other dyadic operators, and examine if we can recover the same dependence on the A_2-characteristic that we have for the original operator (the one with complexity $(0,0)$) times a factor that depends at most polynomially in the complexity of these operators. We will do this analysis for the dyadic paraproduct and for the t-Haar multipliers.

A *Haar shift operator of complexity* (m,n), $m,n \in \mathbb{N}$, is defined by,

$$\big(S^{m,n} f\big)(x) := \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} c^L_{I,J} \langle f, h_I\rangle h_J(x),$$

where $|c^L_{I,J}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{|I|}\sqrt{|J|}}{|L|}$, $\mathcal{D}$ denotes the dyadic intervals, $|I|$ the length of interval I, $\mathcal{D}_m(L)$ denotes the dyadic subintervals of L of length $2^{-m}|L|$, h_I are the Haar functions, and $\langle f, g\rangle$ denotes the L^2-inner product. Notice that the Haar shift operators are automatically uniformly bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, with operator norm less than or equal to one.

For $b \in BMO$, $m,n \in \mathbb{N}$, the *dyadic paraproduct of complexity* (m,n) is defined formally by, with $c^L_{I,J}$ as above,

$$\pi^{m,n}_b f(x) = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_m(L),J\in\mathcal{D}_n(L)} c^L_{I,J} m_I f \,\langle b, h_I\rangle h_J(x),$$

where $m_I f$ is the integral average of f on the interval I.

In [NTV1, HPzTV], paraproducts of complexity $(0,r)$ depending on two weights (average is calculated with respect to one weight, Haar functions are with respect to the other weight, so is the inner product), they have necessary an sufficient testing conditions for boundedness from one weighted space into the other with respect to the *same weights* that appear in the definition of the paraproduct. In our case there are no weights in the definition, and we are asking about boundedness in weighted space. One can check that the paraproduct of complexity (m,n) is the composition of a Haar shift operator of complexity (m,n) and the dyadic paraproduct of complexity $(0,0)$, $\pi^{m,n}_b = S^{m,n}\pi_b$. since both the Haar shift operators [LPetR, CrMPz, H] and the dyadic paraproduct [Be1] obey linear bounds in $L^2(w)$ on the A_2-characteristic of the weight, these estimates immediately will provide a quadratic bound on the A_2-characteristic of the weight for the paraproduct of complexity (m,n), namely, $\|\pi^{m,n}_b f\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C_{m,n}\|b\|_{BMO^d}[w]^2_{A^d_2}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}$. We prove that in fact, the paraproduct of complexity (m,n) obeys the same *linear bound* obtained by Beznosova for the dyadic paraproduct of complexity $(0,0)$, multiplied by a polynomial factor that depends in the complexity.

Theorem 1.1. *For all $w \in A_2^d$, $b \in BMO^d$, then*

$$\|\pi_b^{m,n} f\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C(m+n+2)^5 [w]_{A_2^d} \|b\|_{BMO^d} \|f\|_{L^2(w)}.$$

This is the same phenomena encountered by Chung [Ch] in his proof of the quadratic bound for the commutator $[H,b] = bH - Hb$, he showed that $S^{0,1}\pi_b$ obeys a linear bound, as opposed to the quadratic bound it will trivially inherit from the linear bounds of π_b and $S^{0,1}$, where here $S^{0,1}$ is Petermichl's Haar shift operator, [Pet2]. The dyadic paraproduct of complexity (m,n) is a *generalized Haar shift operator* of complexity $(m, n+1)$, defined as the Haar shift operators replacing the Haar functions h_I and h_J in the definition by normalized in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ characteristic functions, $\chi_I/\sqrt{|I|}$ and $\chi_J/\sqrt{|J|}$, and now one has to assume boundedness on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, imposing size conditions on the coefficients is not enough. Generalized Haar shift operators where introduced in some preprints that have now been superseded by [HLM+]. For Hytönen's representation theorem (and hence for the resolution of the A_2-conjecture) one needs Haar shift operators of arbitrary complexity, and generalized Haar shift operators of complexity $(0,1)$ and $(1,0)$, that is only paraproduct (of complexity $(0,0)$ according to our definition) and their adjoints. Some authors simply used Beznosova's linear bounds or found alternative proofs valid also in $\mathbb{R}^n$ [CrMPz, Ch1, T]. Others, such us [HPzTV, L1, HLM+] use two-weight inequalities for the generalized Haar shift operators based on Sawyer testing conditions that ensure their boundedness, and then check the validity of the Sawyer testing conditions in the one weight case, with considerable effort. In particular in [HLM+] linear bounds in complexity are claimed also for generalized Haar shift operators of arbitrary complexity, their bounds explicitly show the Sawyer testing conditions bounds, and those should correspond to $\|b\|_{BMO}$ in the case of the paraproduct. Theorem 1.1 is not a new result, however it shows how to use the ideas in [NV] for this setting, it explicitly displays the dependence on $\|b\|_{BMO}$, bypassing the more complicated Sawyer two-weight testing conditions, providing a, from our point view, more transparent proof.

For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and weight w, the *t-Haar multiplier of complexity* (m,n) is defined formally by

$$T_{m,n}^{t,w} f(x) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_m(L), J \in \mathcal{D}_n(L)} \frac{\sqrt{|I|\,|J|}}{|L|} \frac{w^t(x)}{(m_I w)^t} \langle f, h_I \rangle h_J(x).$$

When $(m,n) = (0,0)$ we denote the corresponding Haar multiplier by T_w^t. We will show that

Theorem 1.2. *For all* $w \in C^d_{2t}$ *such that* $w^{2t} \in A^d_2$*, then*

$$\|T^{t,w}_{m,n} f\|_2 \leq C(m+n+2)^3 [w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{C_{2t}} [w^{2t}]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A^d_2} \|f\|_2.$$

Moreover, $w \in C^d_{2t}$ *is a necessary condition for the boundedness of* $T^{t,w}_{m,n}$.

This recovers results of Beznosova for T^t_w, the complexity $(0,0)$ case, [Be]. Observe that $T^{t,w}_{m,n}$ is different than both $S^{m,n}T^t_w$ and $T^t_w S^{m,n}$, where T^t_w denotes the t-Haar multiplier of complexity $(0,0)$. Notice that in this case, both $S^{m,n}T^t_w$ and $T^t_w S^{m,n}$ will obey exactly the same bound that T^t_w obeys in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, because the Haar shift multipliers have L^2-norm less than or equal to one.

To prove these theorems we make appropriate modifications to the argument in [NV]. In particular, we need a couple weight lemmas that are proved using Bellman function techniques, Beznosova's Little Lemma whose proof is in [Be1], and the $\alpha\beta$-Lemma whose proof we present at the end of the paper.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide the basic definitions and basic results that will be used through out this paper. In Section 3 we will prove the lemmas that are essential for the main results. In Section 4 we will prove the main estimate for the dyadic paraproduct with complexity (m,n) and we will provide a new proof of the linear bound for the dyadic paraproduct. In Section 5 we will prove the main estimate for the t-Haar multipliers with complexity (m,n), we also provide necessary conditions for these operators to be bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, for $1 < p < \infty$. In the Appendix we prove the $\alpha\beta$-Lemma.

*A*cknowledgment: The authors would like to thank Carlos Pérez, Rafael Espínola and Carmen Ortiz-Caraballo for organizing the Doc-course Harmonic analysis, metric space and applications to PDE, held in Seville, at the Instituto Matemáticas Universidad Sevilla (IMUS) during the summer of 2011. During this time the IMUS provided a very supportive environment that allowed the authors to finalize this project.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Weights, maximal function and dyadic intervals.** A weight w is a locally integrable function in $\mathbb{R}$ taking values in $(0,\infty)$ almost everywhere. The w-measure of a measurable set E, denoted by $w(E)$, is $w(E) = \int_E w(x)dx$. For a measure σ, $\sigma(E) = \int_E d\sigma$, and $|E|$ stands for the Lebesgue measure of E. We define $m^\sigma_E f$ as the average of f on

E, with respect to σ,

$$m^\sigma_E f := \frac{1}{\sigma(E)}\int_E f(x)d\sigma.$$

When $dx = d\sigma$ we simply write $m_E f$, when $d\sigma = v\,dx$ we write $m^v_E f$.

For a weight v we define the *weighted maximal function of* f by

$$(M_v f)(x) = \sup_{I\ni x} m^v_I|f|$$

this operator is bounded in $L^q(v)$ for all $q > 1$ and furthermore

$$\|M_v f\|_{L^q(v)} \le Cq'\|f\|_{L^q(v)}, \tag{2.1}$$

where q' is the dual exponent of q, that is $\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{q'} = 1$. A proof of this fact can be found in [CrMPz]. When $v = 1$ we denote the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function by M. It is well-known that M is bounded in $L^p(w)$ if and only if $w \in A_p$ [Mu].

We will be working with *dyadic intervals* $\mathcal{D}$, where

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_n, \qquad \mathcal{D}_n := \{I \subset \mathbb{R} \ : \ I = [k2^{-n},(k+1)2^{-n}),\ k \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

For a dyadic interval L we define the collection of its dyadic subintervals, $\mathcal{D}(L) := \{I \subset L \ : \ I \in \mathcal{D}\}$, and we also define the n^{th}-generation of dyadic subintervals of L, $\mathcal{D}_n(L) := \{I \in \mathcal{D}(L) \ : \ |I| = 2^{-n}|L|\}$.

Any two dyadic intervals $I, J \in \mathcal{D}$ are either disjoint or one is contained in the other. Any two distinct dyadic intervals $I, J \in \mathcal{D}_n$ are disjoint, furthemore $\mathcal{D}_n$ is a partition of $\mathbb{R}$, and $\mathcal{D}_n(L)$ is a partition of L. For every dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_n$ there is exactly one $\widehat{I} \in \mathcal{D}_{n-1}$, such that $I \subset \widehat{I}$, $\widehat{I}$ is called the parent of I. The interval $\widehat{I} \setminus I$ is also a dyadic interval in $\mathcal{D}_n$ and it is called the sibling of I. Each dyadic interval I in $\mathcal{D}_n$ has two children in $\mathcal{D}_{n+1}$, the right and left halves, denoted I_+ and I_- respectively.

A weight w is *dyadic doubling* if $\frac{w(\widehat{I})}{w(I)} \le C$ for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$. The smallest constant C is called the doubling constant of w and it is denoted by $D(w)$. Note that $D(w) \ge 2$, and that in fact the ratio between the length of a child and the length of its parent is comparable to one, more precisely, $D(w)^{-1} \le \frac{w(I)}{w(\widehat{I})} \le 1 - D(w)^{-1}$.

2.2. **Dyadic A^d_p, reverse Hölder RH^d_p and C^d_s classes.**

A weight w belongs to the *dyadic Muckenhoupt A^d_p-class* if and only if

$$[w]_{A^d_p} := \sup_{I\in\mathcal{D}} (m_I w)(m_I w^{\frac{-1}{p-1}})^{p-1} < \infty, \qquad \text{for} \quad 1 < p < \infty,$$

where $[w]_{A_p^d}$ denotes the A_p^d-characteristic of the weight. If a weigth is in A_p^d then it is dyadic doubling. Also these classes are nested, the larger the p the larger the class: $A_p^d \subset A_q^d$ for all $p \leq q$. The class $A_\infty^d := \bigcup_{p>1} A_p^d$.

A weight w belongs to the *dyadic reverse Hölder* RH_p^d*-class* if and only if

$$[w]_{RH_p^d} := \sup_{I\in\mathcal{D}} (m_I(w^p))^{\frac{1}{p}} (m_I w)^{-1} < \infty, \qquad \text{for} \quad 1 < p < \infty,$$

where $[w]_{RH_p^d}$ denotes the RH_p^d-characteristic of the weight. If a weigth is in RH_p^d then it is not necessarily dyadic doubling (in the non-dyadic world reverse Hölder weights are always doubling). Also these classes are nested, the larger the p the smaller the class, $RH_p^d \subset RH_q^d$ for all $p \geq q$. The class $RH_1^d := \bigcup_{p>1} RH_p^d$. In the non-dyadic world $A_\infty = RH_1$. In the dyadic world the collection of dyadic doubling weights in RH_1^d is A_∞^d, hence A_∞^d is a proper subset of RH_1^d. See [BeRez] for some recent and very interesting results relating these classes.

The class of weight C_s^d was defined in [KP]. The condition is equivalent to a reverse Hölder condition for $s > 1$ and a Muckenhoupt type condition for $s < 0$, its definition is interesting because it simplifies notation when working with the type of Haar multiplier defined in [KP], which here we will call t-Haar multipliers.

A weight w satisfies the C_s^d*-condition*, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, if

$$[w]_{C_s^d} := \sup_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{m_I(w^s)}{(m_I w)^s} < \infty.$$

The quantity defined above is called the C_s^d-characteristic of w. Let us analyze this definition. For $0 \leq s \leq 1$, we have that any weight satisfies the condition with C_s^d-characteristic 1, this is just a consequence of Hölder's Inequality. When $s > 1$, the condition is analogous to the dyadic reverse Hölder condition and $[w]_{C_s^d}^{\frac{1}{s}} = [w]_{RH_s^d}$. For $s < 0$, we have that $w \in C_s^d$ if and only if $w \in A_{1-\frac{1}{s}}^d$, moreover $[w]_{C_s^d}^{-\frac{1}{s}} = [w]_{A_{1-\frac{1}{s}}^d}$, or, alternatively, for $p > 1$, $[w]_{A_p^d}^{\frac{1}{p-1}} = [w]_{C_{\frac{1}{1-p}}^d}$.

2.3. **Weighted Haar functions.** For a given weight v and an interval I define the *weighted Haar function* as

$$h_I^v(x) = \frac{1}{v(I)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{v(I_-)}{v(I_+)}}\, \chi_{I_+}(x) - \sqrt{\frac{v(I_+)}{v(I_-)}}\, \chi_{I_-}(x) \right), \tag{2.2}$$

where $\chi_I(x) = 1$ if $x \in I$ and zero otherwise.

If v is the Lebesgue measure over $\mathbb{R}$, we will denote the *Haar function* simply by $h_I(x)$, and for any $I \in \mathcal{D}$

$$h_I(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|I|}} \left(\chi_{I_+}(x) - \chi_{I_-}(x) \right).$$

It is important fact that $\{h_I^v\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ is an orthonormal system in $L^2(v)$, with the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle_v = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\, \overline{g(x)}\, v(x) dx$. This is a direct consequence of h_I^v being constant on each each children of I, $h_I^v(x)$ having weighted mean zero over the line, $\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}} h_I^v(x) v(x) dx = 0$, and the nestedness properties of the dyadic intervals.

It is a simple exercise to verify that the weighted and unweighted Haar functions are related linearly as follows,

Proposition 2.1. For any weight v, there are numbers α_I^v, β_I^v such that

$$h_I(x) = \alpha_I^v\, h_I^v(x) + \beta_I^v\, \frac{\chi_I(x)}{\sqrt{|I|}}$$

where (i) $|\alpha_I^v| \le \sqrt{m_I v}$, (ii) $|\beta_I^v| \le \frac{|\Delta_I v|}{m_I v}$, and $\Delta_I v := m_{I_+} v - m_{I_-} v$.

For any weight v and any dyadic interval I, $\frac{|\Delta_I v|}{m_I v} = 2\left|1 - \frac{m_{I_-} v}{m_I v}\right| \le 2$. If the weigth v is dyadic doubling then we get a slight improvement on the above upper bound, $\frac{|\Delta_I v|}{m_I v} \le 2\left(1 - \frac{2}{D(v)}\right)$. Note that $\Delta_I v$ could be zero, so a positive lower bound here is not possible.

It is an interesting fact that $\{h_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ is an unconditional basis in $L^p(w)$ if and only if $w \in A_p^d$, see [TV]. In fact the following also holds whenever $v \in A_\infty^d$: $\{h_I^v\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ is an unconditional basis in $L^p(wv)$ if $w \in A_p^d(v)$, that is if

$$[w]_{A_p^d(v)} := \sup_{I \in \mathcal{D}} (m_I^v(w))(m_I^v(w^{\frac{-1}{p-1}}))^{p-1} < \infty.$$

In particular one can verify that $v \in RH_{p'}^d$ if and only if $v^{-1} \in A_p^d(v)$ where $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$, moreover, $[v]_{RH_{p'}^d}^p = [v^{-1}]_{A_p^d}^p(v)$. Therefore if v is dyadic doubling then $\{h_I^v\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ is an unconditional basis in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ (the case $w = v^{-1}$) if $v \in RH_{p'}^d$, this is a consequence of the boundedness of the weighted dyadic square function S_v in weighted $L^p(wv)$, [P2].

2.4. **Dyadic BMO and Carleson sequences.** A locally integrable function b is a function of *dyadic bounded mean oscillation*, $b \in BMO^d$, if and only if

$$\|b\|_{BMO^d} := \Big(\sup_{J\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)} |\langle b, h_I\rangle|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty; \tag{2.3}$$

where $\langle f, g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f\overline{g}$ denotes the standard L^2- inner product on $\mathbb{R}$. Note that if $b_I := \langle b, h_I\rangle$ then $|b_I|\,|I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|b\|_{BMO^d}$, for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$.

A positive sequence $\{\lambda_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a *Carleson sequence with intensity* B if for all $J \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \lambda_I \leq B. \tag{2.4}$$

Therefore if $b \in BMO^d$ then $\{|\langle b, h_I\rangle|^2\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a Carleson sequence with intensity $\|b\|^2_{BMO^d}$.

Let v be a weight, a positive sequence $\{\alpha_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a v*-Carleson sequence with intensity* B if for all $J \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \lambda_I \leq B\, m_J v. \tag{2.5}$$

Proposition 2.2. Let v be a weight, $\{\lambda_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ and $\{\gamma_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be two v-Carleson sequences with intensities A and B respectively then for any $c, d > 0$ we have that

(i) $\{c\lambda_I + d\gamma_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a v-Carleson sequence with intensity $cA+dB$.
(ii) $\{\sqrt{\lambda_I}\sqrt{\gamma_I}\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a v-Carleson sequence with intensity $\sqrt{AB}$.
(iii) $\{(c\sqrt{\lambda_I} + d\sqrt{\gamma_I})^2\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a v-Carleson sequence with intensity $2c^2A + 2d^2B$.

The proof of these statements is quite simple. To prove the first one we just need properties of supremum, for the second one we just have to apply Cauchy-Schwarz and the third one is a consequence of the first two statements combined with the fact that $2cd\sqrt{A}\sqrt{B} \leq c^2A + d^2B$.

3. Main tools

In this section, we state and prove the lemmas and theorems necessary to obtain the estimates for the paraproduct and the t-Haar multipliers of complexity (m, n). The Weighted Carleson Lemma 3.1, α-Lemma 3.5 and Lift Lemma 3.7 are fundamental for all our estimates.

3.1. **Carleson Lemmas.**

The Weighted Carleson Lemma we present here is a variation in the same spirit of the Folklore Lemma [NV] of weighted Carleson embedding theorems that have appeared before in the literature, for example in [NTV1]. The Folklore Lemma 3.3 was introduced and used in [NV]. Here we obtain the Folklore Lemma as an immediate corollary of the Weighted Carleson Lemma 3.1 and what we call the Little Lemma 3.2, introduced by Beznosova in her proof of the linear bound for the dyadic paraproduct.

3.1.1. *Weighted Carleson Lemma.*

Lemma 3.1 (Weighted Carleson Lemma)**.** *Let v be a weight, then $\{\alpha_J\}_{L\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a v-Carleson sequence with intensity B if and only if for all F non-negative v-measurable functions on the line,*

$$\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}(\inf_{x\in L} F(x))\alpha_L \le B\int_{\mathbb{R}} F(x)\,v(x)\,dx; \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Assume that $F \in L^1(v)$ otherwise the first statement is automatically true. First we define $\gamma_L = \inf\limits_{x\in L} F(x)$, we can write

$$\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\gamma_L\alpha_L = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\int_0^\infty \chi(L,t)\,dt\;\alpha_L = \int_0^\infty\Big(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\chi(L,t)\,\alpha\Big)dt,$$

where $\chi(L,t) = 1$ for $t < \gamma_L$ and zero otherwise, and the last equality by the monotone convergence theorem. Define $E_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) > t\}$. Since F is assumed a v-measurable function then E_t is a v-measurable set for every t. Moreover, since $F \in L^1(v)$ we have, by Chebychev's inequality, that the v-measure of E_t is finite for all real t. Moreover, there is a collection of maximal disjoint dyadic intervals $\mathcal{P}_t$ that will cover E_t except for at most a set of v-measure zero.

Observe that $t \ge \gamma_L$ if and only if $\chi(L,t) = 0$, and that $t < \gamma_L$ if and only if $t < \inf_{x\in L} F(x)$. Together these imply that $L \subset E_t$ if and only if $\chi(L,t) = 1$. Then we can write that

$$\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\chi(L,t)\alpha_L = \sum_{L\subset E_t}\alpha_L \le \sum_{L\in\mathcal{P}_t}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(L)}\alpha_I \le B\sum_{L\in\mathcal{P}_t} v(L) = Bv(E_t), \tag{3.2}$$

where we used in the second inequality the fact that $\{\alpha_J\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a Carleson sequence with intensity B. Thus we can estimate

$$\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\gamma_L\alpha_L \le B\int_0^\infty v(E_t)dt = B\int_{\mathbb{R}} F(x)\,v(x)\,dx.$$

where the last equality follows from the layer cake representation.

($\Leftarrow$) Assume (3.1) is true, in particular it will hold for $F(x)=\frac{\chi_J(x)}{|J|}$, and since $\inf_{x\in I}F(x)=0$ if $I\cup J=\emptyset$, $\inf_{x\in I}F(x)=\frac{1}{|J|}$ otherwise, then

$$\frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)}\alpha_I\leq\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\inf_{x\in I}F(x)\,\alpha_I\leq\int_{\mathbb{R}}F(x)\,v(x)\,dx=m_Jv.$$

□

Let v be a weight, $\{\alpha_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ a v-Carleson sequence with intensity B, $\{\lambda_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ a sequence of positive numbers and we define the positive function $F(x)=\lambda^*(x)=\sup_{I\ni x}\lambda_I$. Now apply Lemma 3.1 noting that $\lambda_L\leq\inf_{x\in L}F(x)$, to conclude that

$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\lambda_I\alpha_I\leq B\int_{\mathbb{R}}\lambda^*(x)v(x)\,dx.$$

This is Lemma 6 in [P]. The classical Carleson embedding theorem (see for example [Ko, Ch VIII.E p.258]) characterizes measures μ on the upper half plane that ensure that if $G\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2_+)$, the Hardy space of analytic functions with boundary values $g\in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, then $\|G\|_{L^1(\mu,\mathbb{R}^2_+)}\leq C\|G\|_{H^1}=C\|g\|_1$. The Carleson Lemmas we are presenting are dyadic versions of that result, the measure μ is encoded in the Carleson sequence $\{\alpha_L\}_{L\in\mathcal{D}}$, the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ is replaced by vdx. Let $0\leq F\in L^1(v)$, and define $G(x,t)=\inf_{y\in L(x,t)}F(y)$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$ and $t>0$, where $L(x,t)$ is the unique dyadic interval containing x and of length 2^n with n the unique integer such that $2^{n-1}\leq t<2^n$. If we fix the height $t>0$, $G(x,t)\leq F(x)$, therefore $\|G(\cdot,t)\|_{L^1(v)}\leq\|F\|_{L^1(v)}$, and we can argüe that G is in dyadic $H^1(v)$. Moreover the boundary values $g(x)=\lim_{t\to0}G(x,t)$ exist because for fixed $x\in\mathbb{R}$, $0\leq G(x,t)\leq G(x,s)\leq F(x)$ whenever $s<t$, therefore $0\leq g(x)\leq F(x)$, $g\in L^1(v)$, and $\|g\|_{L^1(v)}\leq\|F\|_{L^1(v)}$. To complete the analogy, $\|G\|_{L^1(\mu,\mathbb{R}^2_+)}=\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\big(\inf_{x\in L}F(x)\big)\alpha_L$, where $\alpha_L=\mu(T_L)$, $T_L=\{(y,t):y\in L,|L|/2\leq t<|L|\}$, and $\{T_L\}_{L\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a partition of the upper half plane.

3.1.2. *Little Lemma.* In order to prove Lemma 3.3 we need Lemma 3.2, which was proved by Beznosova in [Be1] using the Bellman function $B(u,v,l)=u-\dfrac{1}{v(1+l)}$.

Lemma 3.2 (Little Lemma [Be1]). *Let v be a weight, such that v^{-1} is a a weight as well, and let $\{\lambda_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be a Carleson sequence with intensity B then $\{\frac{\lambda_I}{m_Iv^{-1}}\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a v-Carleson sequence with intensity $4B$, that is* *for all* $J \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{\lambda_I}{m_I v^{-1}} \leq 4B\, m_J v.$$

For a proof of this result we refer [Be], Prop. 3.4 or [Be1], Prop. 2.1.

This lemma is to be compared to Lemma 4 in [P], that says if $\{\lambda_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a Carleson sequence then $\{\lambda_I m_I v\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a v-Carleson sequence Note that the assumption is $v \in A_\infty$, and there is no reference to v^{-1}, however if v^{-1} is a weight, then by Cauchy-Schwarz, $1 \leq m_I v\, m_I v^{-1}$, and we will deduce from that result that if $v \in A_\infty$ and v^{-1} is a weight, then $\{\frac{\lambda_I}{m_I v^{-1}}\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a v-Carleson sequence. The Little Lemma provides the same result *without assuming* $v \in A_\infty$.

The following lemma appeared in [NV] where they called it a folklore lemma.

Corollary 3.3 (Folklore Lemma [NV]). Let v be a weight such that v^{-1} is also a weight. Let $\{\lambda_J\}_{L\in\mathcal{D}}$ be a Carleson sequence with intensity B. Let F be a non-negative measurable function on the line. Then

$$\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \inf_{x\in L} F(x) \frac{\lambda_L}{m_L v^{-1}} \leq C\ B \int_{\mathbb{R}} F(x)\, v(x)\, dx.$$

The Folklore Lemma is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.2, and the Weighted Carleson Lemma 3.1. Note that Lemma 3.2 can be deduced from the Folklore Lemma with $F(x) = \chi_J(x)$.

3.2. α**-Lemma.** The following lemma, for $v = w^{-1}$, for $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{4}$ appeared in the work of Beznosova, see [Be], and for $0 < \alpha = \beta < 1/2$ appeared in [NV]. With small modification in their proof, using the Bellman function $B(x,y) = x^\alpha y^\beta$ with domain of definition the first quadrant $x, y > 0$ (a convex set), we can accomplish the result below, this was observed independently by Beznosova [Be2], and the first author [Mo]. We include a proof of the lemma for the convenience of the reader in the Appendix.

Lemma 3.4. ($\alpha\beta$-Lemma) *Let* u, v *be weights then for any* $J \in \mathcal{D}$ *and any* $\alpha, \beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$

$$\frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{|\Delta_I u|^2}{(m_I u)^2} |I| (m_I u)^\alpha (m_I v)^\beta \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} (m_J u)^\alpha (m_J v)^\beta. \tag{3.3}$$

The constant $C_{\alpha,\beta} = \frac{36}{\min\{\alpha - 2\alpha^2, \beta - 2\beta^2\}}$.

We immediately deduce from the lemma the following,

Lemma 3.5 (α-Lemma)**.** *Let $w \in A_2$, then for any $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, the sequence $\{\mu_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$, where*

$$\mu_I := (m_I w)^\alpha (m_I w^{-1})^\alpha |I| \left(\frac{|\Delta_I w|^2}{(m_I w)^2} + \frac{|\Delta_I w^{-1}|^2}{(m_I w^{-1})^2} \right),$$

is a Carleson sequence with intensity at most $2C_\alpha [w]^\alpha_{A_2}$, with $C_\alpha = \frac{36}{\alpha - 2\alpha^2}$.

Proof. Apply Lemma 3.4 to the weights $u = w$, $v = w^{-1}$, $\beta = \alpha$, then

$$\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{|\Delta_I w|^2}{(m_I w)^2} |I| (m_I w)^\alpha (m_I w^{-1})^\alpha \leq C_\alpha (m_J w)^\alpha (m_J w^{-1})^\alpha. \tag{3.4}$$

Apply now Lemma 3.4 to the weights $u = w^{-1}$, $v = w$, and $\beta = \alpha$ then

$$\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{|\Delta_I w^{-1}|^2}{(m_I w^{-1})^2} |I| (m_I w^{-1}\, m_I w)^\alpha \leq C_\alpha (m_J w\, m_J w^{-1})^\alpha. \tag{3.5}$$

Now add (3.4) and (3.5) to get that,

$$\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \mu_I \leq C (m_J w)^\alpha (m_J w^{-1})^\alpha \leq C_\alpha [w]^\alpha_{A_2}.$$

□

A proof of this lemma that works on geometric doubling metric spaces can be found in [NV1, V]. In this paper $\alpha = 1/4$ can be used, and in that case the constant C_α can be replaced by 288.

Remark 3.6. Throughout the proofs a constant C will be a numerical constant that may change from line to line, c_α will be a constant depending on $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, as a multiple of C_α or its square root that may change from line to line. Note that for that range of α, $e^\alpha \leq 2$.

3.3. **Lift Lemma.**

Given a dyadic interval L, and weights u, v, we introduce a family of stoping time intervals $\mathcal{ST}^m_L$ such that the averages of the weights over any stopping time interval $K \in \mathcal{ST}^m_L$ are comparable to the averages on L. This construction was introduced in [NV] for the case $u = w$, $v = w^{-1}$ in their proof of the A_2-conjecture for Haar shift operators with complexity (m, n) with polynomial dependence in the complexity. We also present a Lemma that lifts w-Carleson sequences on intervals to w-Carleson sequences on "stopping intervals", this was used in [NV] for the very specific stoping time intervals $\mathcal{ST}^m_L$. We present the proofs for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 3.7 (Lift Lemma [NV])**.** *Let u and v be weights, L be a dyadic interval and m,n be fixed positive integers. Let $\mathcal{ST}_L^m$ be the collection of maximal stopping time intervals $K\in\mathcal{D}(L)$, where the stopping criteria are either* (i) $\frac{|\Delta_K u|}{m_K u}+\frac{|\Delta_K v|}{m_K v}\geq\frac{1}{m+n+2}$, *or* (ii) $|K|=2^{-m}|L|$. *Then for any stopping interval $K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^m$, $e^{-1}m_L u\leq m_K u\leq e\, m_L u$, and hence also $e^{-1}m_L v\leq m_K v\leq e\, m_L v$.*

Note that the roles of m and n can be interchanged and we get the family $\mathcal{ST}_L^n$ using the same stopping condition (i) and condition (ii) replaced by $|K|=2^{-n}|L|$. Notice that $\mathcal{ST}_L^m$ is a partition of L in dyadic subintervals of length at least $2^{-m}|L|$. Any collection of subintervals of L with this property will be an m-stopping time for L.

Proof. Let K be a maximal stopping time interval, no dyadic interval strictly bigger than K can satisfy any of the stopping criteria. If F is a dyadic interval strictly bigger than K and contained in L then necessarily

$$\frac{|\Delta_F u|}{m_F u}\leq\frac{1}{m+n+2}\qquad\text{and}\qquad\frac{|\Delta_F v|}{m_F v}\leq\frac{1}{m+n+2}. \tag{3.6}$$

In particular this is true for the parent of K. Let us denote $\widehat{K}$ the parent of K and K^* its sibling, and $|m_K u-m_{\widehat{K}}u|=\frac{|\Delta_{\widehat{K}}u|}{2}\leq\frac{m_{\widehat{K}}u}{2(m+n+2)}$. So, $m_{\widehat{K}}u\big(1-\frac{1}{2(m+n+2)}\big)\leq m_K u\leq m_{\widehat{K}}u\big(1+\frac{1}{2(m+n+2)}\big)$. Iterating this process until we reach L, we will get that

$$m_L u\left(1-\frac{1}{2(m+n+2)}\right)^m\leq m_K u\leq m_L u\left(1+\frac{1}{2(m+n+2)}\right)^m$$

remember that $|K|=2^{-j}|L|$ where $0\leq j\leq m$ so we will iterate at most m times. We can obtain the same bounds for v. These clearly imply the estimates in the lemma. □

The following lemma lifts a w-Carleson sequence to m-stopping time intervals with comparable intensity, it was spelled for the particular stopping time $\mathcal{ST}_L^m$ and $w=1$ in [NV]. This is a property of any stopping time that stops once the m^{th}-generation is reached.

Lemma 3.8. *For each $L\in\mathcal{D}$ let $\mathcal{ST}_L^m$ be a partition of L in dyadic subintervals of length at least $2^{-m}|L|$ (in particular it could be the stopping time intervals defined in Lemma 3.7). Assume $\{\nu_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a w-Carleson sequence with intensity at most A, let $\nu_L^m:=\sum_{K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^m}\nu_I$, then $\{\nu_L^m\}_{L\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a w-Carleson sequence with intensity at most $(m+1)A$.*

Proof. In order to show that $\{\nu_L^m\}_{L\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a w-Carleson sequence with intensity at most $(m+1)A$, is enough to show that for any $J\in\mathcal{D}$

$$\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \nu_L^m < (m+1)A\,w(J).$$

Observe that for each dyadic interval K inside a fixed dyadic interval J there exist at most $m+1$ dyadic intervals L such that $K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^m$. Let us denote K^i the dyadic interval that contains K and such that $|K^i| = 2^i|K|$. If $K\in\mathcal{D}(J)$ then L must be $K^0, K^1, \dots$ or K^m. We just have to notice that if $L = K^i$, for $i > m$ then K cannot be in $\mathcal{ST}_L^m$ because $|K| < 2^{-m}|L|$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \nu_L^m = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^m} \nu_K &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{D}(J)} \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}(J) s.t. K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^m} \nu_K \\ &\leq \sum_{K\in\mathcal{D}(J)} (m+1)\nu_k \leq (m+1)A\,w(J).\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows by the definition of w-Carleson sequence with intensity A. The lemma is proved. □

4. Paraproduct

A *paraproduct of complexity* (m,n) is the operator defined formally by

$$\big(\pi_b^{m,n} f\big)(x) := \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} c_{I,J}^L m_I f \langle b, h_I\rangle h_J(x), \tag{4.1}$$

where $|c_{I,J}^L| \leq \frac{\sqrt{|I|}\sqrt{|J|}}{|L|}$ for all dyadic intervals I, J and L.

A paraproduct of complexity $(0,0)$ is the dyadic paraproduct π_b known to be bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ if and only if $b\in BMO^d$. Therefore if $b\in BMO$ then $\pi_b^{m,n}$ is bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, since $\pi_b^{m,n} = S^{m,n}\pi_b$, and the Haar shift operators $S^{m,n}$ are bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with norm less than or equal to one. Furthermore π_b, and hence $\pi_b^{m,n}$, are bounded in $L^2(w)$ whenever $w\in A_2^d$, and we will trace the dependence of the operator bound on the A_2^d-characteristic of the weight, the BMO-norm of b, and the complexity (m,n).

We will show that in fact, the paraproduct of complexity (m,n) obeys the same *linear bound* in $L^2(w)$ with respect to $[w]_{A_2^d}$ obtained by Beznosova for the dyadic paraproduct of complexity $(0,0)$, multiplied by a polynomial factor that depends on the complexity.

The proof given by Nazarov and Volberg, in [NV], to show that Haar shifts operators with complexity (m,n) are bounded in $L^2(w)$ linearly on the A_2^d-characteristic of w and polynomially on the complexity, with appropriate modifications would also work for generalized Haar shifts operators with complexity (m, n), which includes paraproduct of complexity (m, n). The modifications that are needed to cover the class of generalized Haar shift multipliers can be found in [Mo]. We describe those modifications for the paraproduct, and in our proof we trace the linear dependence in the BMO-norm of b as well. But before, we will present this new and conceptually simpler (in our opinion) proof for the linear bound on the A_2^d-characteristic for the dyadic paraproduct, which will allow us to highlight certain elements of the general proof without dwelling with the complexity.

4.1. **Complexity** $(0, 0)$**.** The dyadic paraproduct of complexity $(0, 0)$ is the *dyadic paraproduct* π_b, defined by,

$$(\pi_b f)(x) := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} c_I \, m_I f \, \langle b, h_I\rangle h_I(x), \qquad \text{where } |c_I| \leq 1. \tag{4.2}$$

Beznosova proved in [Be1] that the dyadic paraproduct π_b obeys a linear bound in $L^2(w)$ both in terms of the A_2-characteristic of the weight w and the BMO-norm of b,

Theorem 4.1 ([Be1])**.** *There exists $C > 0$, such that for all $b \in BMO^d$ and for all $w \in A_2$,*

$$\|\pi_b f\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}.$$

Beznosova's proof is based on the α-Lemma, the Little Lemma (these were the new Bellman function ingredients that she introduced), and on Nazarov-Treil-Volberg's two-weight Carleson embedding theorem, which can be found in [NTV]. Next we give another proof of this result, this proof is still based on the α-Lemma 3.5, however it does not make use of the two-weight Carleson embedding theorem, instead we will use properties of Carleson sequences such as the Little Lemma 3.2, and the Weighted Carleson Lemma 3.1, following [NV] argument for Haar Shifts of complexity (m, n).

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Fix $f \in L^2(w)$ and $g \in L^2(w^{-1})$. Define $b_I = \langle b, h_I\rangle$, then $\{b_I^2\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a Carleson sequence with intensity $\|b\|^2_{BMO^d}$.

By duality, suffices to prove:

$$|\langle \pi_b(fw), gw^{-1}\rangle| \leq C\|b\|_{BMO^d}[w]_{A_2}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}\|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}. \tag{4.3}$$

Recall Remark 3.6 for the constants. Note that $|\langle \pi_b(fw), gw^{-1}\rangle| = \left|\left\langle \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} c_I b_I m_I(fw) h_I, gw^{-1}\right\rangle\right|$. Replace $h_I = \alpha_I h_I^{w^{-1}} + \beta_I \frac{\chi_I}{\sqrt{|I|}}$ where

$\alpha_I = \alpha_I^{w^{-1}}$ and $\beta_I = \beta_I^{w^{-1}}$ as described in Proposition 2.1, and get

(4.4)
$$|\langle \pi_b(fw), gw^{-1}\rangle| \;\le\; \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} |b_I| m_I(|f|w)\big|\langle gw^{-1}, \alpha_I h_I^{w^{-1}} + \beta_I \frac{\chi_I}{\sqrt{|I|}}\rangle\big|.$$

Use the triangle inequality to break the sum in (4.4) into two summands to be estimated separately,

$$|\langle \pi_b(fw), gw^{-1}\rangle| \le \; \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2,$$

where, after using the estimates $\alpha_I \le \sqrt{m_I w^{-1}}$, and $\beta_I \le \frac{|\Delta_I w^{-1}|}{m_I w^{-1}}$, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1 \;&:=\; \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} |b_I| m_I(|f|w) |\langle gw^{-1}, h_I^{w^{-1}}\rangle| \sqrt{m_I w^{-1}}\\ \Sigma_2 \;&:=\; \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} |b_I| m_I(|f|w) |\langle gw^{-1}, \chi_I\rangle| \frac{|\Delta_I w^{-1}|}{m_I w^{-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|I|}}.\end{aligned}$$

Estimating Σ_1: First using that $\dfrac{m_I(|f|w)}{m_I w} \le M_w f(x)$ for all $x \in I$, and that $\langle gv, f\rangle = \langle g, f\rangle_v$; second using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and $m_I w \, m_I w^{-1} \le [w]_{A_2}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1 \;&\le\; \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} |b_I| \frac{\inf_{x\in I} M_w f(x)}{\sqrt{m_I w^{-1}}} \big|\langle g, h_I^{w^{-1}}\rangle_{w^{-1}}\big| \; m_I w^{-1} \; m_I w\\ &\le\; [w]_{A_2} \Big(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} |b_I|^2 \frac{\inf_{x\in I} M_w^2 f(x)}{m_I w^{-1}}\Big)^{\frac12} \Big(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \big|\langle g, h_I^{w^{-1}}\rangle_{w^{-1}}\big|^2\Big)^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}$$

Using Weighted Carleson Lemma 3.1, with $F(x) = M_w^2 f(x)$, $v = w$, and $\alpha_I = \frac{|b_I|^2}{m_I w^{-1}}$ (which is an w-Carleson sequence with intensity $4\|b\|^2_{BMO}$, according to Lemma 3.2), then, together with the fact that $\{h_I^{w^{-1}}\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is an orthonormal system in $L^2(w^{-1})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1 \;&\le\; 4[w]_{A_2} \|b\|_{BMO^d} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} M_w^2 f(x) w(x) dx\Big)^{\frac12} \|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}\\ &\le\; C[w]_{A_2} \|b\|_{BMO^d} \|f\|_{L^2(w)} \|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}.\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we used the fact that M_w is bounded in $L^2(w)$ with operator norm independent of w.

Estimating Σ_2: Let $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, using similar arguments than the ones used for Σ_1, we conclude that,

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_2 &\leq \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} |b_I| m_I^w|f|\, m_I^{w^{-1}}|g|\,\sqrt{\mu_I}\,(m_Iw\, m_Iw^{-1})^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ &\leq [w]_{A_2}^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} |b_I|\sqrt{\mu_I}\,\inf_{x\in I} M_wf(x)M_{w^{-1}}g(x),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_I = |I|(m_Iw\, m_Iw^{-1})^{\alpha}\left(\frac{|\Delta_I w|^2}{(m_Iw)^2} + \frac{|\Delta_I w^{-1}|^2}{(m_Iw^{-1})^2}\right)$ as defined in Lemma 3.5, and in the last inequality we used that for any $I\in\mathcal{D}$ for all $x\in I$,

$$m_I^w|f|\, m_I^{w^{-1}}|g| \leq M_wf(x)M_{w^{-1}}g(x).$$

Since $\{|b_I|^2\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ and $\{\mu_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ are Carleson sequences with intensities $\|b\|^2_{BMO^d}$ and $C_\alpha[w]^{\alpha}_{A_2}$, then, by Proposition 2.2, the sequence $\{|b_I|\sqrt{\mu_I}\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a Carleson sequence with intensity $c_\alpha\|b\|_{BMO^d}[w]^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}_{A_2}$. Thus, by Lemma 3.1 with $F(x) = M_wf(x)M_{w^{-1}}g(x)$, $\alpha_I = |b_I|\sqrt{\mu_I}$, and $v = 1$,

$$\Sigma_2 \leq c_\alpha [w]_{A_2}^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\|b\|_{BMO^d}[w]_{A_2}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} M_wf(x)M_{w^{-1}}g(x)\,dx,$$

finally using Cauchy-Schwarz and the fact that $w^{\frac{1}{2}}w^{\frac{-1}{2}} = 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_2 &\leq c_\alpha[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} M_w^2f(x)w(x)dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} M_{w^{-1}}^2g(x)w^{-1}(x)dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= c_\alpha[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|M_wf\|_{L^2(w)}\|M_{w^{-1}}g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})} \\ &\leq c_\alpha[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}\|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}.\end{aligned}$$

These estimates together give (4.3), and the theorem is proved. □

4.2. **Complexity** (m,n)**.** In this section we prove the linear in A_2-characteristic, polynomial in complexity estimate for the paraproducts of complexity (m,n). The proof will follow the general lines of the argument presented in Section 4.1 for the complexity $(0,0)$ case, with the added refinements devised by Nazarov and Volberg [NV], adapted to our setting, to handle the general complexity.

Theorem 4.2. *For all $b \in BMO^d$ and $w \in A_2$, there is $c > 0$ such that*

$$\|\pi_b^{m,n}f\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C(n+m+2)^5[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}.$$

Proof. Fix $f \in L^2(w)$ and $g \in L^2(w^{-1})$ and define $b_I = \langle b, h_I\rangle$ and let $C_m^n := (m+n+2)$. By duality, it is enough to show that

$$|\langle \pi_b^{m,n}(fw), gw^{-1}\rangle| \leq C(C_m^n)^5[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}.$$

We can write the left-hand-side as a double sum that we will estimate,

$$\Big|\Big\langle \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} c_{I,J}\, b_I m_I(fw)\, h_J \;,\; gw^{-1}\Big\rangle\Big|$$
$$\leq \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |b_I|\, \frac{\sqrt{|I|\,|J|}}{|L|} m_I(|f|w)\, |\langle gw^{-1}, h_J\rangle|.$$

As before we will replace $h_I = \alpha_I h_I^{w^{-1}} + \beta_I \frac{\chi_I}{\sqrt{|I|}}$, with $\alpha_I = \alpha_I^{w^{-1}}$, $\beta_I = \beta_I^{w^{-1}}$, and break the double sum into two terms to be estimated separately, then $|\langle \pi_b^{m,n}(fw), gw^{-1}\rangle| \leq \Sigma_1^{m,n} + \Sigma_2^{m,n}$, where

$$\Sigma_1^{m,n} = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |b_I| \frac{\sqrt{|I|\,|J|}}{|L|} m_I(|f|w) |\langle g, h_J^{w^{-1}}\rangle_{w^{-1}}| \sqrt{m_J w^{-1}},$$

$$\Sigma_2^{m,n} = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |b_I| \frac{\sqrt{|I|}}{|L|} m_I(|f|w) |\langle gw^{-1}, \chi_J\rangle| \frac{|\Delta_J w^{-1}|}{m_J w^{-1}}.$$

We define for each weight v, and ϕ a locally integrable function the quantities,

$$S_L^{v,m}\phi := \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |\langle \phi, h_J^v\rangle_v| \sqrt{m_J v} \frac{\sqrt{|J|}}{|L|}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$R_L^{v,m}\phi := \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} \frac{|\Delta_J v|}{m_J v} m_J(|\phi|v)\, \frac{|J|}{\sqrt{|L|}}, \tag{4.6}$$

$$Pb_L^{v,n}\phi := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L)} |b_I|\; m_I(|\phi|v) \frac{\sqrt{|I|}}{\sqrt{|L|}}. \tag{4.7}$$

We also define the following Carleson sequences with $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, see Lemmas 3.8 and 3.5,

$$\mu_K := (m_K w)^\alpha (m_K w^{-1})^\alpha \left(\frac{|\Delta_K w^{-1}|^2}{(m_K w^{-1})^2} + \frac{|\Delta_K w|^2}{(m_K w)^2} \right) |K|,$$

with intensity $C_\alpha [w]_{A_2}^\alpha$,

$$\mu_L^m := \sum_{K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^m} \mu_K, \text{ with intensity } C_\alpha (m+1)[w]_{A_2}^\alpha,$$

$$\mu_L^n := \sum_{K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^n} \mu_K, \text{ with intensity } C_\alpha (n+1)[w]_{A_2}^\alpha,$$

$$\mu_K^b := \frac{|b_K|^2}{|K|} (m_K w\; m_K w^{-1})^\alpha, \text{ with intensity } \|b\|_{BMO^d}^2 [w]_{A_2}^\alpha,$$

$$\mu_L^{b,n} := \sum_{K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^n} \mu_K^b, \text{ with intensity } (n+1)\|b\|^2_{BMO^d}[w]^{\alpha}_{A_2}.$$

Note that

$$\Sigma_1^{m,n} \le \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} Pb_L^{w,n} f\; S_L^{w^{-1},m} g, \quad \Sigma_2^{m,n} \le \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} Pb_L^{w,n} f\; R_L^{w^{-1},m} g.$$

In order to estimate $\Sigma_1^{m,n}$ and $\Sigma_2^{m,n}$ we will use the following estimates for $Pb_L^{w,n} f$, $S_L^{w^{-1},m} g$ and $R_L^{w^{-1},m} g$,

$$S_L^{w^{-1},m} g \le \Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |\langle g, h_J^{w^{-1}}\rangle_{w^{-1}}|^2\Big)^{\frac12} (m_L w^{-1})^{\frac12}, \tag{4.8}$$

$$R_L^{w^{-1},m} g \le 4e^{\alpha} C_m^n (m_L w)^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}} (m_L w^{-1})^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \inf_{x\in L} \big(M_{w^{-1}}(|g|^p)(x)\big)^{\frac1p} \sqrt{\mu_L^m}, \tag{4.9}$$

$$Pb_L^{w,n} f \le 4e^{\alpha} C_m^n (m_L w)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} (m_L w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}} \inf_{x\in L} \big(M_w(|f|^p)(x)\big)^{\frac1p} \nu_L^n, \tag{4.10}$$

where $\nu_L^n = \big(||b||_{BMO^d}\sqrt{\mu_L^n} + \sqrt{\mu_L^{n,b}}\big)$, and $p = 2-(C_m^n)^{-1}$ (note that $1<p<2$). In the proof it will become clear why this is a good choice, the reader is invited to assume first that $p=2$ and reach a point of no return in the argument.

Estimate (4.8) is easy to show, we just need to use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\mathcal{D}_m(L)$ is a partition of L.

$$\begin{aligned} S_L^{w^{-1},m} g &= \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |\langle g, h_J^{w^{-1}}\rangle_{w^{-1}}| \sqrt{m_J w^{-1}} \frac{\sqrt{|J|}}{\sqrt{|L|}} \\ &\le \Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |\langle g, h_J^{w^{-1}}\rangle_{w^{-1}}|^2\Big)^{\frac12} (m_L w^{-1})^{\frac12}. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (4.9) was obtained in [NV]. With a variation over their argument we prove estimate (4.10) in Lemma 4.3. Let us first use estimates (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10) to estimate $\Sigma_1^{m,n}$ and $\Sigma_2^{m,n}$.

Estimate for $\Sigma_1^{m,n}$: Use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\{h_J^{w^{-1}}\}_{J\in\mathcal{D}}$ is an orthonormal system in $L^2(w^{-1})$ and $\mathcal{D} = \cup_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}_m(L)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1^{m,n} &\le \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} Pb_L^{w,n} f\; S_L^{w^{-1},n} g \\ &\le 4e^{\alpha} C_m^n [w]_{A_2}^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \Bigg(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{(\nu_L^n)^2}{m_L w^{-1}} \inf_{x\in L}\Big(M_w(|f|^p)(x)\Big)^{\frac2p}\Bigg)^{\frac12} \|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Weighted Carleson Lemma 3.1 with $F(x) = \big(M_w(|f|^p)(x)\big)^{2/p}$, $v = w$, and $\alpha_L = \frac{(\nu_L^n)^2}{m_L w^{-1}}$. Recall that $\nu_L^n := \big(||b||_{BMO^d}\sqrt{\mu_L^n} + \sqrt{\mu_L^{b,n}}\big)$, by Proposition 2.2, $(\nu_L^n)^2$ is a Carleson measure with intensity at most $C_\alpha C_m^n ||b||^2_{BMO^d}[w]^\alpha_{A_2}$. By Lemma 3.2, $\frac{(\nu_L^n)^2}{m_L w^{-1}}$ is an w-Carleson sequence with comparable intensity, thus we will have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1^{m,n} &\le c_\alpha (C_m^n)^{\frac{3}{2}}[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}\Big\|M_w(|f|^p)\Big\|^{\frac{1}{p}}_{L^{\frac{2}{p}}(w)}\\
&\le c_\alpha \left[\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)'\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} (C_m^n)^{\frac{3}{2}}[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}\big\|\,|f|^p\big\|^{\frac{1}{p}}_{L^{\frac{2}{p}}(w)}\\
&= c_\alpha (C_m^n)^{\frac{5}{2}}[w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we are using that M_w is bounded in $L^q(w)$ for all $q > 1$, moreover $\|M_w f\|_{L^q(w)} \le Cq'\|f\|_{L^q(w)}$. In our case $q = \frac{2}{p}$ and $q' = \frac{2}{2-p} = 2C_m^n$.

Estimate for $\Sigma_2^{m,n}$: Using the fact that $(m_I w\, m_I w^{-1})^{1-\alpha} \le [w]^{1-\alpha}_{A_2}$, for any $I \in \mathcal{D}$

$$\Sigma_2^{m,n} \le \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} Pb_L^{w,n} f \; R_L^{w^{-1},m} g$$

$$\le c_\alpha (C_m^n)^2 [w]^{1-\alpha}_{A_2} \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \inf_{x\in L}\big(M_w(|f|^p)(x)\big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \inf_{x\in L}\big(M_{w^{-1}}(|g|^p)(x)\big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \nu_L^n \sqrt{\mu_L^m}.$$

Since $(\nu_L^n)^2$ and μ_L^m have intensity at most $C_\alpha(n+1)[w]^\alpha_{A_2}\|b\|^2_{BMO}$ and $C_\alpha(m+1)[w]^\alpha_{A_2}$, then, by Proposition 2.2, we have that $\nu_L^n\sqrt{\mu_L^m}$ is a Carleson measure with intensity at most $C_\alpha C_n^m \|b\|_{BMO^d}[w]^\alpha_{A_2}$. If we now apply Lemma 3.1 with $F^p(x) = M_w(|f|^p)(x) M_{w^{-1}}(|g|^p)(x)$, $\alpha_L = \nu_L^n\sqrt{\mu_L^m}$, and $v = 1$, we will have, by Cauchy-Schwarz and the boundedness of M_v in $L^q(v)$ for $q = p/2 > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_2^{m,n} &\le c_\alpha (C_m^n)^3 [w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(M_w(|f|^p)(x)\big)^{\frac{1}{p}}\big(M_{w^{-1}}(|g|^p)(x)\big)^{\frac{1}{p}} dx\\
&\le c_\alpha (C_m^n)^3 [w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\big\|M_w(|f|^p)\big\|^{\frac{1}{p}}_{L^{\frac{2}{p}}(w)}\big\|M_{w^{-1}}(|g|^p)\big\|^{\frac{1}{p}}_{L^{\frac{2}{p}}(w^{-1})}\\
&\le c_\alpha \left[\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)'\right]^{\frac{2}{p}} (C_m^n)^3 [w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\big\||f|^p\big\|^{\frac{1}{p}}_{L^{\frac{2}{p}}(w)}\big\||g|^p\big\|^{\frac{1}{p}}_{L^{\frac{2}{p}}(w^{-1})}\\
&= c_\alpha (C_m^n)^5 [w]_{A_2}\|b\|_{BMO^d}\|f\|_{L^2(w)}\|g\|_{L^2(w^{-1})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Together these estimates prove the theorem, under the assumption that estimate (4.10) holds. □

4.3. **Key Lemma.** The missing step in the previous proof is estimate (4.10), which we now prove. The argument we present is an adaptation of the argument used in [NV] to obtain estimate (4.9).

Lemma 4.3. *Let $b \in BMO$, ϕ a locally integrable function, then*

$$Pb_L^{w,n}\phi \le 4e^{\alpha} C_m^n (m_L w)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} (m_L w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}} \inf_{x\in L} \big(M_w(|\phi|^p)(x)\big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \nu_L^n,$$

where $\nu_L^n = \big(\|b\|_{BMO^d}\sqrt{\mu_L^n} + \sqrt{\mu_L^{b,n}}\big)$*, and* $p = 2 - \frac{1}{m+n+2}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{ST}_L^n$ be the collection of stopping time intervals defined in Lemma 3.7, noting that $\mathcal{D}_n(L) = \cup_{K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^n}\big(\mathcal{D}(K)\cap\mathcal{D}_n(L)\big)$, we get,

$$Pb_L^{w,n}\phi = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{ST}_L^n}\ \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(K)\bigcap\mathcal{D}_n(L)} \frac{|b_I|}{\sqrt{|I|}}\, m_I(|\phi|w)\frac{|I|}{\sqrt{|L|}}.$$

Note that if K is a stopping time interval by the first criterium then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(K)\bigcap\mathcal{D}_n(L)} \frac{|b_I|}{\sqrt{|I|}}\, m_I(|\phi|w)\frac{|I|}{\sqrt{|L|}} &\le \|b\|_{BMO^d}\, m_K(|\phi|w)\frac{|K|}{\sqrt{|L|}} \\ &\le 2C_m^n\|b\|_{BMO^d}\, m_K(|\phi|w)\frac{\sqrt{|K|}}{|L|}\sqrt{\mu_K}\,(m_K w)^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}(m_K w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

the first inequality because $\frac{|b_I|}{\sqrt{|I|}} \le \|b\|_{BMO^d}$ and the second one because

$$1 \le C_m^n\left(\frac{|\Delta_K w|}{m_K w} + \frac{|\Delta_K w^{-1}|}{m_K w^{-1}}\right) \le 2C_m^n\sqrt{\mu_K^n}(m_K w\; m_K w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}.$$

Now we use the fact, proved in Lemma 3.7, that we can compare the averages of the weights in the stopping interval with their averages in L, paying a price of a constant e, and continue estimating by

$$2C_n^m e^{\alpha}\|b\|_{BMO^d} m_K(|\phi|w)\frac{\sqrt{|K|}}{|L|}\sqrt{\mu_K}(m_L w)^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}(m_L w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}.$$

If K is a stopping time interval by the second criterium then the sum collapses to just one term

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(K)\bigcap\mathcal{D}_n(L)} |b_I|\; m_I(|\phi|w)\frac{\sqrt{|I|}}{\sqrt{|L|}} &= \frac{|b_K|}{\sqrt{|K|}}\, m_K(|\phi|w)\frac{|K|}{\sqrt{|L|}} \\ &= m_K(|\phi|w)\frac{\sqrt{|K|}}{|L|}\sqrt{\mu_K^b}(m_K w)^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}(m_K w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}} \\ &\le C_n^m e^{\alpha} m_K(|\phi|w)\frac{\sqrt{|K|}}{|L|}\sqrt{\mu_K^b}(m_L w)^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}(m_L w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\Xi_1(L) := \{K \in \mathcal{ST}_L^n : K$ is a stopping time interval by criterium 1$\}$, and $\Xi_2(L) := \{K \in \mathcal{ST}_L^n : K$ is a stopping time interval by criterium 2$\}$. Note that $\Xi_1(L) \bigcup \Xi_2(L)$ is a partition of L. We then have,

$$Pb_L^{w,n} \leq 2C_n^m e^{\alpha}\,(m_L w)^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}(m_L w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}\Big(\|b\|_{BMO^d}\Sigma_{Pb}^1 + \Sigma_{Pb}^2\Big), \tag{4.11}$$

where the terms Σ_{Pb}^1 and Σ_{Pb}^2 are defined as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{Pb}^1 &:= \sum_{K\in\Xi_1(L)} m_K(|\phi|w)\frac{\sqrt{|K|}}{\sqrt{|L|}}\sqrt{\mu_K},\\
\Sigma_{Pb}^2 &:= \sum_{K\in\Xi_2(L)} m_K(|\phi|w)\frac{\sqrt{|K|}}{|L|}\sqrt{\mu_K^b}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now estimate Σ_{Pb}^1, using Cauchy-Schwarz, note that we can move inside a sum a power $\frac{p}{2} < 1$ that is outside the sum, and that $\mu_L^n := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{ST}_L^n}\mu_K \geq \sum_{I\in\Xi_1(L)}\mu_K$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{Pb}^1 &\leq \Bigg(\sum_{K\in\Xi_1(L)}(m_K(|\phi|w))^2\frac{|K|}{|L|}\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg(\sum_{K\in\Xi_1(L)}\mu_K\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\leq \Bigg(\sum_{K\in\Xi_1(L)}(m_K(|\phi|w))^p\Bigg(\frac{|K|}{|L|}\Bigg)^{\frac{p}{2}}\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{p}}\sqrt{\mu_L^n}. \qquad (4.12)
\end{aligned}$$

By the second stopping criteria $\frac{|K|}{|L|} = 2^{-j}$ for $0 \leq j \leq m$, then

$$\Bigg(\frac{|K|}{|L|}\Bigg)^{\frac{p}{2}} = \Bigg(\frac{2^{-j}|L|}{|L|}\Bigg)^{\frac{p}{2}} = 2^{-j+\frac{j}{2(m+n+2)}} < 2.2^{-j} = 2\frac{|K|}{|L|}. \tag{4.13}$$

Plug (4.13) in (4.12) we will have then,

$$\Sigma_{Pb}^1 \leq \Bigg(2\sum_{K\in\Xi_1(L)}(m_K(|\phi|w))^p\frac{|K|}{|L|}\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{p}}\sqrt{\mu_L^n}.$$

Use Hölder's inequality inside the sum, then Lift Lemma 3.7, to get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{Pb}^1 &\leq \Bigg(2\sum_{K\in\Xi_1(L)}(m_K(|\phi|^p w))(m_K w)^{p-1}\frac{|K|}{|L|}\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{p}}\sqrt{\mu_L^n}\\
&\leq 2^{\frac{1}{p}}e^{\alpha\frac{p-1}{p}}(m_L w)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\Bigg(\frac{1}{|L|}\sum_{K\in\Xi_1(L)}\int_K|\phi(x)|^p w(x)\,dx\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{p}}\sqrt{\mu_L^n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the intervals $K \in \Xi_1(L)$ are disjoint subintervals of L, therefore, $\sum_{K\in\Xi_1(L)} \int_K |\phi(x)|^p w(x)\,dx \le \int_L |\phi(x)|^p w(x)\,dx$, and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^1_{Pb} &\le 2e^{\alpha} m_L w \Big(\frac{m_L(|\phi|^p w)}{m_L w}\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sqrt{\mu^n_L} \\ &\le 2e^{\alpha} m_L w \inf_{x\in L} \Big(M_w(|\phi|^p)(x)\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sqrt{\mu^n_L}. \qquad (4.14) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we estimate Σ^2_{Pb}, to get,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^2_{Pb} &\le \Big(\sum_{K\in\Xi_2} (m_K(|\phi| w))^2 \frac{|K|}{|L|}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\sum_{K\in\Xi_2} \mu^b_K\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\le \Big(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{ST}^n_L} (m_K(|\phi| w))^p \Big(\frac{|K|}{|L|}\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sqrt{\mu^{b,n}_L}. \end{aligned}$$

Following the same steps as we did in the estimate of Σ^1_{Pb} we will have

$$\Sigma^2_{Pb} \le 2e^{\alpha} m_L w \inf_{x\in L} \Big(M_w(|\phi|^p)(x)\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sqrt{\mu^{b,n}_L}. \qquad (4.15)$$

Insert estimates (4.14) and (4.15) into (4.11). All together we can bound $Pb^{w,n}_L$ by

$$4C^m_n e^{2\alpha} (m_L w)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} (m_L w^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}} \inf_{x\in L} \Big(M_w(|\phi|^p)(x)\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \nu^n_L.$$

The lemma is proved. □

Remark 4.4. In [NV1], Nazarov and Volberg extend the results that they had in [NV] for Haar shifts to others metric spaces with geometric doubling. Following the same modifications in the argument made from [NV] to [NV1], one could obtain the result as we obtained in Theorem 4.2 on a metric space with geometric doubling.

5. Haar Multipliers

For a weight w, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, a *t-Haar multiplier of complexity* (m, n) is the operator defined as

$$T^{m,n}_{t,w} f(x) := \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);\, J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} \frac{\sqrt{|I|\,|J|}}{|L|} \Big(\frac{w(x)}{m_L w}\Big)^t \langle f, h_I\rangle h_J(x). \qquad (5.1)$$

For complexity $(0, 0)$ these operators are the Haar multipliers introduced for $t = 1$ in [P] and denoted by T_w, and for other real numbers t introduced in [KP], denoted by T^t_w. Note that these operators have symbols, namely $\frac{\sqrt{|I|}\sqrt{|J|}}{|L|}\big(\frac{w(x)}{m_L w}\big)^t$, that depend on: the space variable

x, the frequency encoded in the dyadic interval L, and the complexity encoded in the subintervals $I \in \mathcal{D}_n(L)$ and $J \in \mathcal{D}_m(L)$. These makes these operators more akin to pseudodifferential operators where the trigonometric functions have been replaced by the Haar functions.

5.1. **Necessary conditions.** Let us first show a necessary condition on the weight w so that $T^{m,n}_{w,t}$ is bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$. This necessary C^d_{tp}-condition is the same condition found in [KP] for the t-Haar multiplier of complexity $(0,0)$, see also [P1]

Theorem 5.1. *Let m, n be positive integers and let t be a real number then if $T^{m,n}_{t,w}$ is a bounded operator in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ then w is a weight in C^d_{tp}.*

Proof. Assume that $T^{m,n}_{t,w}$ is bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for $1 < p < \infty$, there exists C such that for any $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$ we have that $\|T^{m,n}_{t,w} f\|_p \leq C\|f\|_p$. Thus for any $I_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ we should have that

$$\|T^{m,n}_{t,w} h_{I_0}\|_p^p \leq C^p \|h_{I_0}\|_p^p. \tag{5.2}$$

Let us compute then the norm on the left-hand-side of (5.2). First observe that,

$$T^{m,n}_{t,w} h_{I_0}(x) = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n(L); J \in \mathcal{D}_m(L)} \frac{\sqrt{|I|\,|J|}}{|L|} \left(\frac{w(x)}{m_L w}\right)^t \langle h_{I_0}, h_I \rangle h_J(x). \tag{5.3}$$

By the properties of dyadic filtration $\langle h_{I_0}, h_I\rangle = 1$ if $I_0 = I$ and $\langle h_{I_0}, h_I \rangle = 0$ otherwise. Also there exists just one dyadic interval L_0 such that $I_0 \subset L_0$ and $|I_0| = 2^{-n}|L_0|$. Therefore we can collapse the sums in (5.3) in just one sum, and calculate the L^p-norm as follows,

$$\|T^{m,n}_{t,w} h_{I_0}\|_p^p = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_m(L_0)} \frac{\sqrt{|I_0|}\sqrt{|J|}}{|L_0|} \left(\frac{w(x)}{m_{L_0} w}\right)^t h_J(x)\right|^p dx.$$

Furthermore, since $\mathcal{D}_m(L_0)$ is a partition of L_0, the power p can travel inside the sum, and we get,

$$\|T^{m,n}_{t,w} h_{I_0}\|_p^p = \frac{|I_0|^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|L_0|^{p-1}} \frac{m_{L_0}(w^{tp})}{(m_{L_0} w)^{pt}}. \tag{5.4}$$

Inserting $\|h_{I_0}\|_p^p = |I_0|^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$ and (5.4) in (5.2), we will have that for any dyadic interval I_0 there exists C such that

$$\frac{|I_0|^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|L_0|^{p-1}} \frac{m_{L_0}(w^{tp})}{(m_{L_0} w)^{pt}} \leq C^p |I_0|^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$$

which implies $\frac{m_{L_0}(w^{tp})}{(m_{L_0} w)^{pt}} \leq C^p |I_0|^{1-p} |L_0|^{p-1} = C^p 2^{n(p-1)} =: C_{n,p}$. Now observe that this inequality should hold for any $L_0 \in \mathcal{D}$, we just have to choose as I_0 any of the descendants of L_0 in the n-th generation, also note that n is a fixed value. Therefore

$$[w]_{C^d_{2t}} = \sup_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \big(m_L(w^{tp})\big)\big(m_L w\big)^{-pt} \leq C_{n,p}.$$

We conclude that $w \in C^d_{tp}$, moreover $[w]_{C^d_{tp}} \leq 2^{n(p-1)}||T^{m,n}_{t,w}||^p_p$. □

5.2. **Sufficient condition.** The C^d_{2t}-condition is not only necessary but also sufficient for most t for a t-Haar multiplier of complexity (m,n) to be bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, this was proved in [KP] for the case $m=n=0$. Here we are concerned not only with the boundedness but also with the dependence on the C^d_{2t}-constant of the operator norm. For the case $m=n=0$ and $t=1,\pm 1/2$ this was studied in [P2]. Beznosova [Be] was able to obtain estimates, under the additional condition on the weight $w^{2t}\in A_p$ for some $p>1$, for the case of complexity $(0,0)$ and for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$. We recover her results when $w^{2t}\in A_2$ and for complexity (m,n). Our proof differs from hers in that we are adapting the methods of Nazarov and Volberg [NV] to this setting as well. Both proofs rely on the α-Lemma 3.4 and on the Little Lemma 3.2.

Theorem 5.2. *Let t be a real number and w a weight in C^d_{2t}, such that $w^{2t}\in A^d_2$ and that satisfies the C^d_{2t} condition with constant $[w]_{C^d_{2t}}$. Then the Haar Multiplier with depth (m,n) is bounded in $L_2(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover*

$$\|T^{m,n}_{t,w}f\|_2 \leq C(m+n+2)^3[w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{C^d_{2t}}[w^{2t}]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A^d_2}\|f\|_2.$$

Proof. Fix $f,\ g\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. By duality, it is enough to show that

$$|\langle T^{m,n}_{t,w}f,g\rangle| \leq C(m+n+2)^3[w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{C^d_{2t}}[w^{2t}]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A^d_2}\|f\|_2\|g\|_2.$$

The inner product on the left-hand-side can be expanded into a double sum, that we now estimate,

$$\Big|\Big\langle \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\ \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} \frac{\sqrt{|I|\,|J|}}{|L|}\,\frac{w^t}{(m_L w)^t}\langle f,h_I\rangle h_J, g\Big\rangle\Big|$$

$$\leq \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\ \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} \frac{\sqrt{|I|\,|J|}}{|L|}\,\frac{|\langle f,h_I\rangle|}{(m_L w)^t}\,|\langle gw^t,h_J\rangle|.$$

Once again, we will replace h_J by a linear combination of a weighted Haar function and a characteristic function, $h_J=\alpha_J h^{w^{2t}}_J+\beta_J\frac{\chi_J}{\sqrt{|J|}}$, where $\alpha_J=\alpha^{w^{2t}}_J$, $\beta_J=\beta^{w^{2t}}_J$, $|\alpha_J|\leq\sqrt{m_J w^{2t}}$, and $|\beta_J|\leq\frac{|\Delta_J(w^{2t})|}{m_J w^{2t}}$. Now break into two terms to be estimated separately so that,

$$|\langle T^{m,n}_{t,w}f,g\rangle| \leq \Sigma^{m,n}_3+\Sigma^{m,n}_4,$$

where

$$\Sigma_3^{m,n} = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} \frac{\sqrt{|I|\,|J|}}{|L|} \frac{\sqrt{m_J(w^{2t})}}{(m_L w)^t} |\langle f, h_I\rangle|\, |\langle g w^t, h_J^{w^{2t}}\rangle|,$$

$$\Sigma_4^{m,n} = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L);J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} \frac{|J|\sqrt{|I|}}{|L|(m_L w)^t} \frac{|\Delta_J(w^{2t})|}{m_J(w^{2t})} |\langle f, h_I\rangle|\, m_J(|g|w^t).$$

Again let $p = 2-(C_n^m)^{-1}$, and define as in (4.5) and (4.6), the quantities $S_L^{v,m}\phi$ and $R_L^{v,m}\phi$, we will use here the case $v = w^{2t}$, and corresponding estimates. Define a new quantity

$$P_L^n\phi := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L)} |\langle f, h_I\rangle| \frac{\sqrt{|I|}}{\sqrt{|L|}}.$$

We also define the following sequences for $0<\alpha<1/2$,

$$\eta_I := \big(m_I(w^{2t})\, m_I(w^{-2t})\big)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{|\Delta_I(w^{2t})|^2}{|m_I w^{2t}|^2} + \frac{|\Delta_I(w^{-2t})|^2}{|m_I w^{-2t}|^2} \right) |I|,$$

by Lemma 3.5, a Carleson sequence with intensity $C_\alpha [w^{2t}]_{A_2}^{\alpha}$, and

$$\eta_L^m := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{ST}_L^m} \eta_I,$$

where the stopping time $\mathcal{ST}_L^m$ is defined as in Lemma 3.7 but with respect to the weight w^{2t}, and by Lemma 3.8, it is a Carleson sequence with intensity $C_\alpha(m+1)[w^{2t}]_{A_2}^{\alpha}$.

Observe that on the one hand $\langle g w^t, h_J^{w^{2t}}\rangle = \langle g w^{-t}, h_J^{w^{2t}}\rangle_{w^{2t}}$, and on the other $m_J(|g|w^t) = m_J(|g w^{-t}| w^{2t})$. Therefore,

$$\Sigma_3^{m,n} = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{(m_L w)^t} S_L^{w^{2t},m}(g w^{-t})\; P_L^n f,$$

$$\Sigma_4^{m,n} = \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{(m_L w)^t} R_L^{w^{2t},m}(g w^{-t})\; P_L^n f.$$

Estimates (4.8) and (4.9) hold for $S_L^{w^{2t},m}(g w^{-t})$ and $R_L^{w^{2t},m}(g w^{-t})$ with w^{-1} and g replaced by w^{2t} and $g w^{-t}$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_L^{w^{2t},m}(g w^{-t}) &\le (m_L w^{2t})^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |\langle g w^{-t}, h_J^{w^{2t}}\rangle_{w^{2t}}|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ R_L^{w^{2t},m}(g w^{-t}) &\le e^{\alpha} C_m^n (m_L w^{2t})^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} (m_L w^{-2t})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}} F^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \sqrt{\eta_L^m}, \end{aligned}$$

where $F(x) = \inf_{x\in L}\big(M_{w^{2t}}(|gw^{-t}|^p)(x)\big)^{\frac{2}{p}}$. Estimating $P_L^n f$ is very simple:

$$P_L^n f \le \Bigg(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L)} \frac{|I|}{|L|}\Bigg)^{\frac12}\Bigg(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L)} |\langle f, h_I\rangle|^2\Bigg)^{\frac12} = \Bigg(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L)} |\langle f, h_I\rangle|^2\Bigg)^{\frac12}.$$

Estimating $\Sigma_3^{m,n}$: Plug in the estimates for $S_L^{w^{2t},m}(gw^{-t})$ and $P_L^n f$, observe that $\frac{(m_L w^{2t})^{\frac12}}{(m_L w)^t} \le [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}}$, use Cauchy-Schwarz, and we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_3^{m,n} &\le \sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}} \Bigg(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |\langle gw^{-t}, h_J^{w^{2t}}\rangle_{w^{2t}}|^2\Bigg)^{\frac12}\Bigg(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n(L)} |\langle f, h_I\rangle|^2\Bigg)^{\frac12} \\
&\le [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}} \|f\|_2 \Bigg(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_m(L)} |\langle gw^{-t}, h_J^{w^{2t}}\rangle_{w^{2t}}|^2\Bigg)^{\frac12} \\
&\le [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}} \|f\|_2 \|gw^{-t}\|_{L^2(w^{2t})} = [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}} \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimating $\Sigma_4^{m,n}$: Plug in the estimates for $R_L^{w^{2t},m}(gw^{-t})$ and $P_L^n f$, where $F(x) = \big(M_{w^{2t}}(|gw^{-t}|^p)(x)\big)^{2/p}$, use Cauchy-Schwarz observing that $\frac{(m_L w^{-2t})^{\frac{-\alpha}{2}}(m_L w^{2t})^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{(m_L w)^t} \le [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}}[w^{2t}]^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}_{A^d_2}(m_L w^{-2t})^{-\frac12}$, and get

$$\Sigma_4^{m,n} \le 4e^{\alpha} C^n_m [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}}[w^{2t}]^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}_{A^d_2}\|f\|_2 \Bigg(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{\eta_L^m}{m_L w^{-2t}} \inf_{x\in L} F(x)\Bigg)^{\frac12}.$$

Now using Weighted Carleson Lemma 3.1 with $\alpha_L = \frac{\eta_L^m}{m_L(w^{-2t})}$ (which by Lemma 3.2 is a w^{2t}-Carleson sequence with intensity $c_\alpha(m+1)[w]^{\alpha}_{A^d_2}$), $F(x) = \big(M_{w^{2t}}|gw^{-t}|^p(x)\big)^{2/p}$, and $v = w^{2t}$,

$$\Sigma_4^{m,n} \le c_\alpha (C^n_m)^2([w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}}[w^{2t}]^{\frac12}_{A^d_2}\|f\|_2 \Big\| M_{w^{2t}}(|gw^{-t}|^p)\Big\|^{\frac1p}_{L^{\frac2p}(w^{2t})}.$$

Using (2.1), that is the boundedness of $M_{w^{2t}}$ in $L^{\frac2p}(w^{2t})$ for $2/p > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_4^{m,n} &\le c_\alpha (C^n_m)^2 (2/p)' [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}}[w^{2t}]^{\frac12}_{A^d_2}\|f\|_2 \Big\| |gw^{-t}|^p\Big\|^{\frac1p}_{L^{\frac2p}(w^{2t})} \\
&\le c_\alpha (C^n_m)^3 [w]^{\frac12}_{C^d_{2t}}[w^{2t}]^{\frac12}_{A^d_2}\|f\|_2\|g\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

The theorem is proved. □

The following observations were made by Beznosova in the complexity $(0, 0)$ case, see her dissertation [Be].

Note that when $t = -\frac{1}{2}$, we have that

$$\|T^{m,n}_{-\frac{1}{2},w} f\|_2 \le C(m+n+2)^3 [w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{C^d_{-1}} [w^{-1}]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A^d_2} \|f\|_2,$$

by definition, $[w]_{C^d_{-1}} = [w]_{A^d_2} = [w^{-1}]_{A^d_2}$, therefore

$$\|T^{m,n}_{-\frac{1}{2},w} f\|_2 \le C(m+n+2)^3 [w]_{A^d_2} \|f\|_2. \tag{5.5}$$

For $t = \frac{1}{2}$, we have that

$$\|T^{m,n}_{\frac{1}{2},w} f\|_2 \le C(m+n+2)^3 [w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{C^d_1} [w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A^d_2} \|f\|_2,$$

since $[w]_{C^d_1} \le 1$ by Hölder's inequality then

$$\|T^{m,n}_{\frac{1}{2},w} f\|_2 \le C(m+n+2)^3 [w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A^d_2} \|f\|_2, \tag{5.6}$$

Both estimates (5.5) and (5.6) are sharp, because the same dependence on the A_2 -characteristic for the operators with complexity $(0,0)$ are known to be sharp, [P2].

For $t = 1$ we unfortunately cannot recover the sharp dependence found in [P2], in this case we will have

$$\|T^{m,n}_{w} f\|_2 \le C(m+n+2)^3 [w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{C^d_2} [w^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A^d_2} \|f\|_2,$$

by definition $[w]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{C^d_2} = [w]_{RH^d_2}$, and by a result of Beznosova [Be], $w^2 \in A^d_2$ if and only if $w \in RH^d_2 \bigcap A^d_{\frac{3}{2}}$, moreover $[w^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A^d_2} \le [w]_{RH^d_2} [w]_{A^d_{\frac{3}{2}}}$. Therefore

$$\|T^{m,n}_{w} f\|_2 \le C(m+n+2)^3 [w]^2_{RH^d_2} [w]_{A^d_{\frac{3}{2}}} \|f\|_2.$$

which for complexity $(0,0)$ is a little worse than the bound from [P2]

$$\|T_w\|_2 \le C D(w) [w]^2_{RH^d_2} \|f\|_2.$$

because we have that $D(w) \le [w]_{A^d_{\frac{3}{2}}}$, see [Be].

APPENDIX

Proof of the $\alpha\beta$-Lemma 3.4 [Be2, Mo]. We will show this inequality using a Bellman function type method. Consider $B(u,v) = u^\alpha v^\beta$ defined on the domain $\mathbb{D} = \{(u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2, u > 0, v > 0\}$. Note that $\mathbb{D}$ is convex. Trivially we have that

$$0 < B(u,v) \le u^\alpha v^\beta \qquad \text{for all} \quad (u,v) \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Our first goal is to show that

$$-(du,dv) d^2 B \begin{pmatrix} du \\ dv \end{pmatrix} \ge C_{\alpha,\beta} \left[u^{\alpha-2} v^\beta (du)^2 + u^\alpha v^{\beta-2} (dv)^2 \right], \tag{5.7}$$

where $C_{\alpha,\beta} = \min\{\alpha - 2\alpha^2, \beta - 2\beta^2\}$, and d^2B is the Hessian matrix of $B(u,v)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
-(du,dv)d^2B\begin{pmatrix} du \\ dv \end{pmatrix} &= -(du,dv)\begin{bmatrix} \alpha(\alpha-1)u^{\alpha-2}v^{\beta} & \alpha\beta u^{\alpha-1}v^{\beta-1} \\ \alpha\beta u^{\alpha-1}v^{\beta-1} & \beta(\beta-1)u^{\alpha}v^{\beta-2} \end{bmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} du \\ dv \end{pmatrix} \\
&= -\alpha(\alpha-1)u^{\alpha-2}v^{\beta}(du)^2 - 2\alpha\beta u^{\alpha-1}v^{\beta-1}dudv - \beta(\beta-1)u^{\alpha}v^{\beta-2}(dv)^2 \\
&= \big[-\alpha(\alpha-1)-\alpha^2\big]u^{\alpha-2}v^{\beta}(du)^2 + \big[-\beta(\beta-1)-\beta^2\big]u^{\alpha}v^{\beta-2}(dv)^2 \\
&\qquad + \alpha^2u^{\alpha-2}v^{\beta}(du)^2 + \beta^2u^{\alpha}v^{\beta-2}(dv)^2 - 2\alpha\beta u^{\alpha-1}v^{\beta-1}dudv \\
&= \big[-\alpha(\alpha-1)-\alpha^2\big]u^{\alpha-2}v^{\beta}(du)^2 + \big[-\beta(\beta-1)-\beta^2\big]u^{\alpha}v^{\beta-2}(dv)^2 + \\
&\qquad \big(\alpha u^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}v^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}du - \beta u^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}v^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}du\big)^2 \\
&\geq \big[-\alpha(\alpha-1)-\alpha^2\big]u^{\alpha-2}v^{\beta}(du)^2 + \big[-\beta(\beta-1)-\beta^2\big]u^{\alpha}v^{\beta-2}(dv)^2 \\
&= (\alpha-2\alpha^2)u^{\alpha-2}v^{\beta}(du)^2 + (\beta-2\beta^2)u^{\alpha}v^{\beta-2}(dv)^2 \\
&\geq C_{\alpha,\beta}\big[u^{\alpha-2}v^{\beta}(du)^2 + u^{\alpha}v^{\beta-2}(dv)^2\big],
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\alpha,\beta} = \min\{(\alpha - 2\alpha^2), (\beta - 2\beta^2)\}$, note $C_{\alpha,\beta} > 0$ iff α and β are in $(0, 1/2)$.

Now let us show that if (u_-, v_-) and (u_+, v_+) are in $\mathbb{D}$ and we define (u_0, v_0) as $u_0 = \frac{u_-+u_+}{2}$ and $v_0 = \frac{v_-+v_+}{2}$ then

$$B(u_0,v_0) - \frac{B(u_-,v_-)+B(u_+,v_+)}{2} \geq C_{\alpha,\beta}\left[\frac{v_0^{\beta}}{u_0^{2-\alpha}}|u_+-u_-|^2 + \frac{u_0^{\alpha}}{v_0^{2-\beta}}|v_+-v_-|^2\right].$$

Consider for $-1 \leq t \leq 1$,

$$u(t) = \frac{(t+1)u_+ + (1-t)u_-}{2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad v(t) = \frac{(t+1)v_+ + (1-t)v_-}{2}.$$

We define $b(t) := B(u(t), v(t))$, note that $b(0) = B(u_0, v_0)$, $b(1) = B(u_+, v_+)$, $b(-1) = B(u_-, v_-)$, $\frac{du}{dt} = \frac{u_+-u_-}{2}$ and $\frac{dv}{dt} = \frac{v_+-v_-}{2}$. If (u_+, v_+) and (u_-, v_-) are in $\mathbb{D}$ then $(u(t), v(t))$ is also in $\mathbb{D}$ for all $|t| \leq 1$, since $\mathbb{D}$ is convex. It is a calculus exercise to show that

$$b(0) - \frac{b(1)+b(-1)}{2} = \frac{-1}{2}\int_{-1}^{1}(1-|t|)b''(t)dt.$$

Also it is easy to check that

$$-b''(t) = -\big(\frac{du}{dt}, \frac{dv}{dt}\big)d^2B\begin{pmatrix} \frac{du}{dt} \\ \frac{dv}{dt} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus

$$-b''(t) \geq \frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{4}\left[\frac{(v(t))^{\beta}}{(u(t))^{2-\alpha}}|u_+-u_-|^2 + \frac{(u(t))^{\alpha}}{(v(t))^{2-\beta}}|v_+-v_-|^2\right].$$

Since $u_0 = \frac{u_-+u_+}{2}$ then we can write $u(t) = u_0 + \frac{1}{2}t(u_+ - u_-)$ then for $t \in [\frac{-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$

$$\frac{1}{2}u_0 \leq u(t) \leq \frac{3}{2}u_0.$$

By the same reasoning, for $t \in [\frac{-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$

$$\frac{1}{2}v_0 \leq v(t) \leq \frac{3}{2}v_0.$$

Then, for $|t| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and observing that because $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1/2$, then

$$-b''(t) \geq \frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{9}\left[\frac{v_0^\beta}{u_0^{2-\alpha}}|u_+ - u_-|^2 + \frac{u_0^\alpha}{v_0^{2-\beta}}|v_+ - v_-|^2\right].$$

Since $-b''(t) \geq 0$ for $\frac{1}{2} \leq |t| \leq 1$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} b(0) - \frac{b(-1)+b(1)}{2} &\geq \frac{-1}{2}\int_{\frac{-1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(1-|t|)b''(t)dt \\ &\geq \frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{18}\Big(\frac{v_0^\beta}{u_0^{2-\alpha}}|u_+ - u_-|^2 + \frac{u_0^\alpha}{v_0^{2-\beta}}|v_+ - v_-|^2\Big)\int_{\frac{-1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(1-|t|)dt \\ &\geq \frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{36}\Big(\frac{v_0^\beta}{u_0^{2-\alpha}}|u_+ - u_-|^2 + \frac{u_0^\alpha}{v_0^{2-\beta}}|v_+ - v_-|^2\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} B(u_0,v_0) \quad &- \quad \frac{B(u_-,v_-)+B(u_+,v_+)}{2} = b(0) - \frac{b(-1)+b(1)}{2} \\ &\geq \quad \frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{36}\Big(\frac{v_0^\beta}{u_0^{2-\alpha}}|u_+ - u_-|^2 + \frac{u_0^\alpha}{v_0^{2-\beta}}|v_+ - v_-|^2\Big). \qquad (5.8) \end{aligned}$$

Now we can use the Bellman function argument. Given weights u and v (we are abusing notation, u, v are also the variables in the Bellman function), let $u_+ = m_{J_+}u$, $u_- = m_{J_-}u$, $v_+ = m_{J_+}v$, $v_- = m_{J_-}v$. Thus $(u_-,v_-),(u_+,v_+) \in \mathbb{D}$ and $u = m_J u$ and $v = m_J v$.

$$\begin{aligned} &|J|(m_J u)^\alpha (m_J v)^\beta = |J|u^\alpha v^\beta \geq |J|B(u,v) \geq \\ &\geq |J_+|B(u_+,v_+) + |J_-|B(u_-,v_-) + |J|\frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{36}\left(\frac{(m_J v)^\beta}{(m_J u)^{2-\alpha}}|\Delta_J u|^2 + \frac{(m_J u)^\alpha}{(m_J v)^{2-\beta}}|\Delta_J v|^2\right) \\ &= |J_+|B(u_+,v_+) + |J_-|B(u_-,v_-) + |J|\frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{36}(m_J u)^\alpha\ (m_J v)^\beta\left(\frac{|\Delta_J u|^2}{(m_J u)^2} + \frac{|\Delta_J v|^2}{(m_J v)^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We can also estimate $B(u_+,v_+)$, $B(u_-,v_-)$ by (5.8), continuing this process we will have that

$$\frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{36}\frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}(J)}(m_I u)^\alpha\ (m_I v)^\beta |I|\left(\frac{|\Delta_I u|^2}{(m_I u)^2} + \frac{|\Delta_I v|^2}{(m_I v)^2}\right) \leq B(u,v) \leq (m_J u)^\alpha (m_J v)^\beta.$$

□

References

[Be] O. Beznosova, *Bellman Functions, Paraproducts, Haar Multipliers and Weighted Inequalities*. PhD. Dissertation, University of New Mexico (2008).

[Be1] O. Beznosova, *Linear bound for the dyadic paraproduct on weighted Lebesgue space $L^2(w)$.J. Func. Anal.* **255** (2008), 994 –1007.

[Be2] O. Beznosova, *Personal communication.*

[BeRez] O. Beznosova, A. Reznikov, *Sharp estimates involving A_∞ and LlogL constants, and their applications to PDE.* Preprint (2011) available at arXiv:1107.1885

[Bu] S.M. Buckley, *Estimates for operator norms on weighted spaces and reverse Jensen inequalities.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **340** no. 1 (1993), 253–272.

[Ch] D. Chung, *Sharp estimates for the commutators of the Hilbert, Riesz and Beurling transforms on weighted Lebesgue spaces*. To appear in Indiana U. Math. J.. Preprint (2010) available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1001.0755

[Ch1] D. Chung, *Weighted inequalities for multivariable dyadic paraproducts*. Publ. Mat. **55**, no. 2 (2011), 475–499.

[ChPPz] D. Chung, M. C. Pereyra, C. Pérez, *Sharp bounds for general commutators on weighted Lebesgue spaces*. To appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Preprint (2010) available at arXiv:1002.2396

[CrMoe] D. Cruz-Uribe, SFO, K. Moen. *Sharp norm inequalities for commutators of classical operators*. Preprint (2010) available at arXiv:1008.0381v1

[CrMPz] D. Cruz-Uribe, SFO, J. Martell, C. Perez, *Sharp weighted estimates for classical operators*. Preprint (2010) available at arXiv:1011.5784

[CrMPz1] D. Cruz-Uribe, J. M. Martell, C. Peréz, *Weights, extrapolation and the theory of Rubio the Francia*. Birkhäuser, (2011).

[CoFe] R. Coiffman, C. Fefferman. *Weighted norm inequalities for maximal functions and singular integrals*. Studia Math. **51** (1974), 241–250.

[DGPPet] O. Dragičevič, L. Grafakos, M. C. Pereyra, S. Petermichl, *Extrapolation and sharp norm estimates for classical operators in weighted Lebesgue spaces*. Publ. Mat. **49**, (2005), 73–91.

[H] T. Hytönen, *The sharp Weighted Bound for general Calderón-Sygmund Operators*. Preprint (2010) available at arXix:10074330v1.

[HLM+] T. Hytönen, M. Lacey, H. Martkainen, T. Orponen, M. Reguerra, E. Sawyer, I. Uriarte-Tuero, *Weak and strong type estimates for Maximal truncations of Calderón Zygmund Operators on A_p weighted spaces*. Preprint (2011) available at arXiv:1103.5229v1.

[HukTV] S. Hukovic, S. Treil, and A. Volberg, *The Bellman functions and sharp weighted inequalities for for square function*. Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., **113** (2000), 97–113.

[HPzTV] T. Hytönen, C. Peréz, S. Treil, A. Volberg *Sharp weighted estimates for dyadic shifts and the A_2 conjecture*. Preprint (2010) available at arXix:10074330v1.

[KP] N.H. Katz, M. C. Pereyra *Haar multipliers, paraproducts and weighted inequalities*. Analysis of Divergence, **10**, 3, (1999), 145-170.

[Ko] P. Koosis, *Introduction to H_p Spaces*. London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series **40**, Cambridge University Press, 1980.

[L] M. Lacey, *On the A_2 inequality for Calderón-Zygmund operators*. Preprint (2011) available at arXiv:1106.4802

[L1] M. T. Lacey, *The Linear Bound in A_2 for Calderón-Zygmund operators: A Survey*. Submitted to the proceedings of the Jozef Marcinkiewicz Centenary Conference. Preprint (2010) available at arXiv:1011.5784

[LPetR] M. Lacey, S. Petermichl, M. Reguera, *Sharp A_2 inequalities for Haar shift operators*. Math. Ann. **348** (2010), no. 1, 127–141.

[Le] A. Lerner, *Sharp weighted norm inequalities for Littlewood-Paley operators and singular integrals*. Adv. Math. **226** (2011), 3912-3926.

[Mo] J. C. Moraes, PhD Dissertation, University of New Mexico (expected May 2012).

[Mu] B. Muckenhoupt, *Weighted norm inequalities for the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **165** (1972), 207–226.

[NRezV] F. Nazarov, A. Reznikov, A. Volberg, *The proof of A_2 conjecture in a geometrically doubling metric space.* Preprint (2011) available at arXiv:1106.1342

[NV] F. Nazarov, A. Volberg, *Bellman function, polynomial estimates of weighted dyadic shifts, and A_2 conjecture*. Preprint (2011).

[NV1] F. Nazarov, A. Volberg, *A simple sharp weighted estimate of the dyadic shifts on metric spaces with geometric doubling*. Preprint (2011) available at arXiv: 11044893v2.

[NTV] F. Nazarov, S. Treil and A. Volberg, *The Bellman functions and the two-weight inequalities for Haar Multipliers*. Journal of the AMS, **12** (1999), 909–928.

[NTV1] F. Nazarov, S. Treil and A. Volberg, *Two weight inequalities for individual Haar multipliers and other well localized operators.* Math. Res. Lett. **15** (2008), no.3, 583-597.

[Or] C. Ortiz, *Quadratic A_1 bounds for commutators of singular integrals with BMO functions*. To appear Indiana U. Math. J. Preprint (2011) available at arXiv:1104.1069

[P] M. C. Pereyra *On the resolvents of dyadic paraproducts.* Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **10**, 3, (1994), 627-664.

[P1] M. C. Pereyra *Lecture notes on dyadic harmonic analysis. Contemp. Math.*, 289:1-60, 2001.

[P2] M. C. Pereyra *Haar multipliers meet Bellman function.* Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **25**, 3, (2009), 799-840.

[PzTV] C. Pérez, S. Treil, A. Volberg, *On A_2 conjecture and corona decomposition of weights*. Preprint (2010) available at arXiv: 1005.2630

[Pet1] S. Petermichl, *Dyadic shift and a logarithmic estimate for Hankel operators with matrix symbol.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **330** (2000) # 6, 455–460.

[Pet2] S. Petermichl, *The sharp bound for the Hilbert transform on weighted Lebesgue spaces in terms of the classical A_p characteristic*. Amer. J. of Math. **129** (2007), 1355–1375.

[Pet3] S. Petermichl, *The sharp bound for the Riesz transforms*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (2008) 1237–1249.

[PetV] S. Petermichl, A. Volberg, *Heating of the Ahlfors-Beurling operator: Weakly quasiregular maps on the plane are quasiregular*. Duke Math J. **112** (2002), 281–305.

[T] S. Treil, *Sharp A_2 estimates of Haar shifts via Bellman function.* Preprint (2011) available at arXiv:1105.2252

[TV] S. Treil, A. Volberg, *Wavelets and the angle between past and future*. J. Functional Anal., **143** (1997), 269–308.

[V] A. Volberg, *Bellman function technique in Harmonic Analysis. Lectures of INRIA Summer School in Antibes, June 2011.* Preprint (2011) available at arXiv:1106.3899

[W] J. Wittwer,*A sharp estimate on the norm of the martingale transform*. Math. Res. Letters, **7** (2000), 1–12.

[W1] J. Wittwer, *A sharp estimate on the norm of the continuous square function*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), no. 8, 2335–2342 (electronic).

Department of mathematics and Statistics, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-001
E-mail address: `jmoraes@unm.edu, crisp@math.unm.edu`